

# The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH  
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND  
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XXI

DECEMBER, 1925

Number 3

Editorial	161
The Date of Cicero's First Oration against Catiline	Franklin H. Potter 164
Tacitus the Historian	Louis E. Lord 177
A Dialogue	T. B. Chetwood 191
A Few Principles and Characteristics of the <i>Ratio Studiorum</i>	Clement J. Fuerst 204
A Tribute to High-School Latin	Andrew F. West 211
Classical Background	Albert Billheimer 212
The Summer Session in Rome	Grant Showerman 215
The First Summer Session of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens	Walter Miller 217
Notes	219
When Was December 31st, 66 B.C.?	Franklin H. Potter
Doctor Walter Leaf and Fate	Arthur L. Keith
Cato, <i>De Agri Cultura</i> , 63	Eli Edward Burriess
Heracles up to Date	Floyd A. Spencer
<i>Fretus</i> with the Ablative Case	H. C. Nutting
Current Events	225
Hints for Teachers	227
Book Reviews	233
<i>The Republic of Plato</i> , B. Jowett (Smiley); <i>Homer and His Influence</i> , John A. Scott (Dorjahn); <i>Ad Alpes</i> , Herbert C. Nutting (White).	
Recent Books	238

THE TORCH PRESS  
CEDAR RAPIDS IOWA

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON  
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIK-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO  
FUKUOKA, SENDAI  
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the coöperation of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States

## Editors-in-Chief

**FRANK J. MILLER**  
The University of Chicago  
*Editor for New England*

**JOSEPH W. HEWITT**  
Wesleyan University

**ARTHUR T. WALKER**  
The University of Kansas  
*Editor for the Pacific States*  
**HERBERT C. NUTTING**  
The University of California

## Associate Editors

**GEORGE H. CHASE**  
Harvard University  
**DANIEL W. LOYEMAN**  
East High School, Cleveland  
**VICTOR D. HILL**  
Ohio University

**WALTER MILLER**  
The University of Missouri  
**JULIANNE A. ROELER**  
Franklin High School, Portland, Ore.  
**GEORGE HOWE**  
University of North Carolina  
**BERTHOLD L. ULLMAN**  
University of Chicago

**CLARENCE W. GLEASON**  
Roxbury Latin School, Boston  
**JOHN A. SCOTT**  
Northwestern University  
**WALTER A. EDWARDS**  
Los Angeles High School, Los Angeles

*Business Manager*  
**CHARLES H. WELLES**  
University of Iowa

*Managing Editor*  
**FRANKLIN H. POTTER**  
University of Iowa

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published monthly except in July, August, and September by The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union, an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents).

Claims for Missing Numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to **W. L. CARR**, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the province of Ontario, Canada. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory, with the addition of 25 cents a year for postage for Canadian members.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to **MONROE N. WYMOND**, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to **FRED L. FARLEY**, College of the Pacific, Stockton, California. The territory of this Association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to **W. L. CARR**, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

5. Concerning advertising to **C. H. WELLES**, Business Manager, Iowa City, Iowa.

Communications for the Editors and manuscripts should be sent to **ARTHUR T. WALKER**, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to **JOSEPH W. HEWITT**, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., and from the Pacific States to **HERBERT C. NUTTING**, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Twenty-five Reprints are furnished free to the authors of major articles. Additional copies, if ordered in advance, are supplied at cost. Orders for additional reprints should accompany the corrected proof.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on October 16, 1922, under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of Postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 16, 1925.

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

---

VOLUME XXI

DECEMBER, 1925

---

NUMBER 3

## Editorial

---

### A NOTABLE CELEBRATION

The semi-centennial exercises of Vanderbilt University in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding were held at Nashville during the four days, October 15 to 18. Since the writer had been delegated by the then president of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to represent the Association on this occasion, he deems it only proper to report some, at least, of the outstanding features of this great celebration to the Association which he had the honor to represent.

It was a great celebration. Its greatness impressed one immediately on his arrival, and this impression increased as, one by one, the various features of the program unfolded.

It was great in its personnel. This was a cross-section of the higher educational world, made up as it was of nearly 300 delegates representing foreign and American universities and colleges, as well as numerous foundations and learned societies. Add to these the trustees and faculties of the celebrant university itself, the student body, and an imposing array of alumni. Add also the enthusiastic citizens of the home city, proud of the great institution in its midst. Many great figures of national significance were there; and, uniting all, at once the dominant force and gracious host of all, was the veteran Chancellor himself, whose long service to the University has been one of its chief supports in its upward struggles, and has brought him ungrudging praise in the hour of its triumphant success.

It was great in its hospitality. The hospitality of the South is famous. But this out-did itself. It was a sort of superhospitality, gathering up its incoming hordes of guests into a most heartening friendliness, making all feel welcome and at home from the moment when scores of smiling students met us in the dim old station and whisked us off to the comfortable quarters which had been provided for us, to the climax of the celebration when in academic pomp our long procession wound down from the Capitol to the stately Tennessee War Memorial Auditorium, where we were presented to and welcomed one by one by the presiding Chancellor. We were made to feel at one with it all, — that it was our celebration.

It was great in its organization and its program. Never were arrangements more complete and more perfectly carried out in all physical details, nor could a richer and better balanced program of functions, of papers, and of speakers be desired. The program opened, appropriately, with a survey of higher education in the South, including the birth and growth of Vanderbilt itself, during the past fifty years, beginning with a picture of the pathetic, brave struggles in that period of poverty and disorganization, through those early decades of alternating discouragement and hope, to its present position of high achievement and still greater promise. Later there were papers wise, witty, brilliant, discussions of problems vital to American institutions of higher learning, in which there was plenty of disagreement but no acrimony. The great outflowering of the Medical School, with its new buildings, increased faculties and facilities, firmly based on new endowment, had a large and inspiring place in the program of functions and of papers.

But the celebration was greatest in its spirit. There was a bigness, a generous outgoing of something that was more than mere scholarship, which, unfortunately, is sometimes selfish, narrow and narrowing, often hard and unsympathetic, — something that seemed to bring the best of all to the surface, to cause scholarship for once to come to a visible spiritual flowering. In that atmosphere things were said in all frankness and received with hearty



applause which made one old enough to remember ancient sectional prejudices fairly gasp, until he remembered also that learning has no section lines and that here was a brotherhood of truth-seekers, afraid of nothing but error and ashamed of nothing but unwillingness to face and conquer it.

This spiritual climax was reached when, in the presence of a great audience, after speeches by the French ambassador and by a well-known general of the United States Army, there was tendered and accepted the beautiful Alumni Memorial Hall, and the roll of those young Vanderbilt men, whose memorial this was, who had given their lives in the great World War to buy a greater freedom for the world, was solemnly read out. And from him who read this roll, in a speech of exquisite simplicity and appreciation, we heard these startling words: "War is not always waste. It sometimes makes and saves. Bunker Hill and Yorktown made this country free. Gettysburg and Appomatox kept it united."

Scholarship? Research? These are good, but they are too often only of mind and matter. They will never bring forth the richest fruits until they flower into a spirit which dares to say words like those in a place like that; and which is also great enough to receive those words (as they were received) with unanimous and whole hearted applause.

It was a triumph of the spirit.

## THE DATE OF CICERO'S FIRST ORATION AGAINST CATILINE

By FRANKLIN H. POTTER  
University of Iowa

I should hardly dare to reopen this question if I did not have some relevant facts and considerations which seem to have escaped the notice of the scholars who have treated this problem so extensively before. Two definite dates are known which seem to point to the 7th of November as the date of the oration. In spite of this, the 8th is the date now generally accepted since the time that Constantin John published his exhaustive discussion in *Philologus* 46 (1888).<sup>1</sup> The arguments in favor of the 8th are based entirely on the implications of certain expressions purposely used ambiguously by Cicero in the first oration. Most of the discussion since John's article appeared has been directed at an effort to find some way of re-interpreting the direct evidence to make it harmonize with the conclusions of John.<sup>2</sup> Strangely enough, so far as I know, it has heretofore occurred to no one to accept the direct, definite evidence and challenge the validity of the evidence on which John's conclusions are based.

Catiline called a meeting of his followers at Laeca's house on the night of the 6th of November.<sup>3</sup> His plans were now definite. He wished to leave at once to join Manlius and the army, but he wanted Cicero put out of the way first.<sup>4</sup> Two followers

<sup>1</sup> The acceptance of this date is by no means unanimous. Boissier (*La Conjuration de Catilina*, 1908) following Drumann, and Hardy (*The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context: a Re-Study of the Evidence*, 1924) accept the 7th as the date of the oration.

<sup>2</sup> It is needless to review the numerous discussions which this problem has called forth. Every view which has been advocated has been shown by subsequent discussion to be untenable.

<sup>3</sup> Cum inter falcarios ad M. Laecam nocte ea quae consecuta est posterum diem Nonarum Novembrium. — *Pro Sulla*, 52.

promised that "on that very night a little before daylight" (I, 9) they would call on Cicero and murder him in his bed. The attempt as planned was made on the morning of the 7th,<sup>5</sup> but Cicero had been forewarned and the attempt failed. On the same day,<sup>6</sup> the 7th of November, he summoned the senate to meet

\* Tum Catilinae dies exeundi, tum ceteris manendi condicio, tum discriptio totam per urbem caedis atque incendiorum constituta est. . . . cum Catilina egrederetur ad exercitum, Lentulus in urbe relinqueretur, Cassius incendiis, Cethegus caedi praeponeretur, Autronio ut occuparet Etruriam praescriberetur, cum omnia ornarentur, instruerentur, pararentur. . . — *Pro Sulla*, 52 f.

Fuisti igitur apud Laecam illa nocte, Catilina, distribuisti partis Italiae, statuisti quo quemque proficisci placeret, delegisti quos Romae relinqueres, quos tecum educeres, discripsisti urbis partis ad incendia, confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum, dixisti paulum tibi esse etiam nunc morae, quod ego viverem. — I, 9.

Postremo . . . coniurationis principes convocat ad M. Porcium Laecam, ibique . . . docet se Manlium praemisisse ad eam multitudinem quam ad capiunda arma paraverat, item alios in alia loca opportuna qui initium belli facerent, seque ad exercitum proficisci cupere, si prius Ciceronem oppressisset: eum suis multum officere. — *Sal. Cat.* 27.

\* C. Cornelius eques Romanus . . . et cum eo L. Vargunteius senator constituere ea nocte paulo post cum armatis hominibus sicuti salutatum introire ad Ciceronem ac de improvviso domui suae imparatum confodere. Curius ubi intellegit quantum periculum consuli impendeat propere per Fulviam Ciceroni dolum qui parabatur enuntiat. Ita illi ianua prohibiti tantum facinus frustra susceperant. — *Sal. Cat.* 28.

Haec ego omnia vixdum etiam coetu vestro dimisso comperi; domum meam maioribus praesidiis munivi atque firmavi, exclusi eos quos tu ad me salutatum mane miseras, cum illi ipsi venissent quos ego iam multis ac summis viris ad me id temporis venturos esse praedixeram. — I, 10.

Plutarch (*Cicero*, 16) says: "But Catiline ordered Marcius and Cethegus with swords to go to the door in the morning as if to salute Cicero and falling upon him to slay him. Fulvia, a woman of the nobility, going in the night announced this to Cicero warning him to guard against those with Cethegus. But they came at daybreak . . ."

Dio (xxxvii, 32 f.) says: "A certain two men promised to go into Cicero's house at daybreak and there slay him. But he was forewarned of this."

\* Hesterno die, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Statoris convocavi. II, 12.

Plutarch (*Cicero*, 16) after mentioning the disturbance at Cicero's door due to the exclusion of the would-be assassins says, "Going forth Cicero called the senate into the temple of Jupiter Stator."

in the temple of Jupiter Stator and there delivered the oration in question.

Scholars who for other reasons to be discussed later in this paper have assumed that the oration was delivered on the 8th attempt to escape from the conclusions implied in the direct evidence by assuming that the attempt on Cicero's life was postponed twenty-four hours; or that after the attempt on his life the consul shut himself up in his house twenty-four hours to see what the conspirators would do, before he summoned the senate. These alternatives are wholly unsupported by evidence and are contrary to the evident meaning of all four authors who contribute to our knowledge of these events. They are extremely unlikely. If such delay had occurred, it would have been so important a factor in the events that it certainly would have been mentioned by some of our authorities.

One who recalls the executive efficiency of Catiline as described by Cicero (III, 16 f.) will find it impossible to believe that the attempt on Cicero's life could have been postponed while Catiline was there directing affairs in person.

Cicero learned of the plans "when the meeting had scarcely broken up." His informers went *propere* according to Sallust, *in the night* according to Plutarch. If, as some scholars assume contrary to the evidence, the meeting lasted till daylight, — too late for the attempt on that morning, — Curius must have slipped away before the meeting closed. He must have believed and reported to Cicero that the attempt would be made that very morning. Cicero would not know of the postponement. But Cicero expressly says (*loc. cit.*) that the attempt was made at the very time that he had expected it, — *id temporis*. One who will read the evidence cited in Note 5 above must accept the view of John, von Stern, and Holmes that the attempt was made on the morning of the 7th.

Those who believe that Cicero, notwithstanding he had detailed information of Catiline's plans and had been waiting for some overt act which would justify him in proceeding against him, allowed a full day after the attempt on his life to pass before he



summoned the senate must ignore the evident meaning of the only two passages (Note 6) which touch on this point. Plutarch's language excludes the possibility of such delay, but most explicit is Cicero's statement where, as has already been pointed out by many scholars, the order of words<sup>7</sup> clearly shows that the senate was summoned on the same day as the attempted assassination.

The state of affairs represented at the time of the oration is easily understood if the seventh is the date. Cicero, who had before daylight on the 7th learned of Catiline's plans as outlined at Laeca's house, and had incontrovertible evidence of the overt attempt to murder him, was not the man to suppress such information. Even before the morning attempt on his life he had communicated these things to many eminent men of the state. It is difficult to believe that such general ignorance of Catiline's plans as is indicated at the time of the first oration (I, 30; II, 3) could continue till the morning of the 8th. Cicero's *patefeci in senatu hesterno die* (II, 6) proves that the first oration was delivered before the news had been widely spread. The revelation of the facts known to Cicero was a distinct surprise to Catiline and his accomplices (I, 1; I, 8; II, 6; II, 13; *Orator*, 129). This might be possible on the morning of the 7th. Catiline was not so stupid as not to have learned before the morning of the 8th that his plans had been divulged. He came to the meeting of the senate in the temple of Jupiter Stator posing as an injured innocent and did not yet know how accurately his plans were known.<sup>8</sup> He might be expected to do this on the morning

<sup>7</sup> The insertion in this passage of the vocative, *Quirites*, between *die* and *cum*, a very doubtful reading given in some texts, does not alter the sense. A vocative never interrupts grammatical connection. *Cum* still remains grammatically attached to *die*. The passage from Asconius cited by von Stern is not a parallel case. *Ante annum quam haec dicerentur Catilina cum redisset ex Africa Torquato et Cotta cons. accusatus est.* — *In Tog. Cand.* p. 76, Kies. The *cum*-clause is not here directly connected with the time-words.

<sup>8</sup> *Catilina ut erat paratus ad dissimulanda omnia demisso vultu voce supplici postulare a patribus coepit ne quid de se temere crederent.* — *Sal. Cat.* 31. *Patere tua consilia non sentis?* — I, 1.

of the seventh, but by the 8th his plans and the attempt on the life of the consul would certainly be so widely known that Catiline would never have presented himself in the senate,<sup>9</sup> nor would Cicero have been so foxy in revealing his information to Catiline and the rest. The temple of Jupiter Stator, being near the summit of the Velia, offered a position which could not easily be rushed by an attacking party and also furnished a meeting place to which Cicero could go from his home on the Palatine without exposing himself by passing through the forum. The selection of this place indicates a degree of uncertainty and nervousness on the part of Cicero which might be expected on the 7th, but not on the 8th.

Catiline had planned to leave Rome on the night of the 7th.<sup>10</sup> His only cause for delay was the living Cicero, and his arrangements to murder Cicero the next morning relieved him of all reason to remain longer in Rome. He had sent forward men to await him armed. The silver eagle had been sent ahead (I, 24; II, 13). If these arrangements had not been made on the night of the 6th, they would not have been made after Catiline had learned of the miscarriage of his plans to get rid of Cicero. Cicero told Catiline to leave the city *as he had planned to do*.<sup>11</sup> This must have been said before the time originally set for his

<sup>9</sup> Omnia superioris noctis consilia ad me perlata esse sentiunt; patefeci in senatu hesterno die; Catilina ipse pertimuit, profugit. — II, 6.

<sup>10</sup> Tum Catilinae dies exeundi . . . constituta est. — *Pro Sul.* 52.

Quaesivi a Catilina in nocturno conventu ad M. Laecam fuisset necne . . . quid ea nocte egisset, ubi fuisset, quid in PROXIMAM constituisset. — II, 13.

Confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum, dixisti paulum tibi esse etiam nunc morae, quod ego viverem. — I, 9.

Seque ad exercitum proficisci cupere, si prius Ciceronem oppressisset. — *Sal. Cat.* 27.

<sup>11</sup> Perge quo coepisti. — I, 10.

Num dubitas id me imperante facere quod iam tua sponte faciebas? Exire ex urbe iubet consul hostem. — I, 13.

Quamquam quid ego te invitem, a quo iam sciam esse praemissos qui tibi ad Forum Aurelium praestolarentur. — I, 24.

Si iste, quo intendit, in Manliana castra pervenerit. — I, 30.

Cum haesitaret, cum teneretur, quaesivi quid dubitaret proficisci eo quo iam pridem pararet. — II, 13.

departure, the night of the 7th, had passed, as is clearly shown by the tenses used in the cited passages.

Those who claim that the time was too short to crowd in all these events by the morning of the 7th, — the meeting at Laeca's house, the attempt on Cicero's life, the spreading of the information, the summoning and assembling of the senate — are sufficiently answered by the events of the 3d of December (III, 6). The arrest of the Allobroges on the Mulvian bridge three miles north of Rome took place after midnight, but the praetors reported to Cicero at daybreak, and he summoned the senate, which met at sunrise (Plutarch, *Cic.* 19) in the temple of Concord. The conspirators came to this meeting as unsuspecting as Catiline had come to the temple of Jupiter Stator on the morning of the 7th of November.

Our next evidence is derived from the date of the *senatus consultum ultimum*. John (*Phil.* 46, 659 ff.) has proved quite conclusively that this must have been on either the 21st of October or the 22d. He believes it must have been on the 22d because he has for other reasons concluded that the oration was on the 8th of November. Cicero (I, 7) tells us that on the 21st of October he laid some very precise and alarming information before the senate to the effect that a military uprising in Etruria was imminent within six days, and that a general massacre of the optimates would immediately follow. Plutarch (*Cic.* 15) and Dio Cassius (xxxvii, 31) show that Cicero's revelations were supported by other evidence. Our question, then, is, Did the senate pass the *s. c. ult.* immediately or wait till the next day? How can anyone in the absence of direct evidence and against the natural implication of such evidence as we have, believe that the senate was so supinely stupid and indifferent as to delay action with a dangerous military uprising to be followed by a general massacre aimed at themselves only six days off? Or can anyone believe that the great orator-consul, who realized the seriousness of the situation, could fail to arouse the senate and extort suitable and immediate action?

Sallust (29) tells us that Cicero feeling himself unable to cope

with a twofold evil — the activities of Manlius in Etruria and the plans for a general urban massacre — referred the situation to the senate, upon which the *s. c. ult.* was passed. Sallust tells us that at that time the senate had already been disturbed by rumors of the people.<sup>12</sup> This language certainly could not apply to the senate after the day on which Cicero had given such definite and alarming information of the plans of the conspirators as he gave on the 21st. The statements of Sallust and Cicero harmonize only on the assumption that the 21st was the date of the *senatus consultum ultimum*.

Plutarch and Dio Cassius supplement, but do not contradict the evidence of Cicero and Sallust. Plutarch (*Cic.* 15) tells of a midnight visit of Crassus, Marcellus, and Scipio Metellus to Cicero to show certain anonymous letters which had been addressed to Crassus and others. He relates that Cicero called the senate the next day at daybreak and had the letters read. These letters warned the recipients to leave Rome to avoid a projected massacre. "But when also Q. Arrius, an ex-praetor, reported the organization of troops in Etruria, and Manlius was reported to be hanging around those cities with a large force and constantly awaiting some news from Rome," the *senatus consultum ultimum* was passed. What Plutarch says of Manlius may well be the identical information which Cicero says he gave on the 21st. The situation on that day may be set forth as follows: As soon as the plans of Catiline had been definitely formed, friends of the conspirators were immediately warned anonymously. At the same time Cicero's spies reported to him what they had learned. Before giving out the facts which he possessed, Cicero had the anonymous warnings, supported by information given by Arrius, read in the senate to prepare the unbelievers for his message; after which the *senatus consultum ultimum* was passed. The incident of the anonymous letters would lose all significance if we assumed that it followed the definite announcement of a general massacre as made by Cicero on the 21st. When Crassus and the others made that midnight call on the consul, they believed

<sup>12</sup> Rem ad senatum refert iam antea volgi rumoribus exagitatum. — 29.



they had urgent and alarming news, which would be no news if Cicero's announcement had preceded. But from Plutarch's *Crassus* 13 we learn that Cicero attributed great importance to these letters, crediting them with being the evidence by which he proved the existence of the conspiracy. These letters therefore must have been a strong factor in evoking the *senatus consultum ult.*, and Plutarch's language clearly indicates that the reading of the letters, the announcement of Arrius,<sup>13</sup> the report about Manlius, and the *senatus consultum ult.* belong to the same session of the senate and, as I have shown, could not have been later than Cicero's announcement on the 21st. If, as von Stern suggests, the consul himself was the author of those anonymous letters, we may be sure that his plans were well made and did not fail to produce the desired result.

John, Hardy, and others find in Dio Cassius conclusive evidence of two meetings of the senate. John thinks the first of the two was the one mentioned by Cicero as on the 21st, and that the *sen. con. ult.* was passed on the next day. It is hard to see how anyone could reach such a conclusion with the text of Dio before him. Dio says that first the events of the city were reported to Cicero by certain anonymous letters; and already Crassus and certain others of the nobles had received such; on the strength of these a decree was passed declaring the existence of a *tumultus* and ordering a search for those responsible for it. But in the second place the tidings from Etruria were reported, and the senate voted *in addition* to commit the guarding of the city to the consuls, etc. If this really involves two meetings, the earlier of the two, as Hardy believes, must have been before the twenty-first, for on the 21st Cicero gave definite information as to the date of the imminent uprising in Etruria, and Dio says the tidings from Etruria caused the *senatus consultum ultimum*. But there is nothing in Dio's text which suggests two meetings of the senate. On the contrary the *πρότερα* and *δύτερα* of the text (not to be confused with *προτεραία* and *δευτεραία*) suggest two

<sup>13</sup> Επει δὲ καὶ Κόιντος κτλ. The use of καὶ here is significant and supports this view.

stages of the proceedings of one sitting. The compound, *προσψηφίσαντο*, a word rarely used by Dio, shows that the *senatus consultum ult.* was more closely connected in point of time to the decree of a *tumultus* than the business of two separate sessions on different days.

Asconius (*In Pison.* 4) says that the day of the oration was the eighteenth from the date of the *senatus consultum ultimum*. If, as I have shown, the *senatus consultum ultimum* was passed on the 21st of October, this would establish the date of the oration as the 7th of November, corroborating the most natural conclusion reached from the starting-point of the meeting on the night of the 6th at Laeca's house.

The following passages cause some to believe that this oration was not delivered on the day following the meeting at Laeca's house:

Quid PROXIMA, quid SUPERIORE nocte egeris, ubi fueris, quos convocaveris, quid consili ceperis quem nostrum ignorare arbitraris? — I, 1.

Recognosce mecum tandem noctem ILLAM SUPERIOREM; iam intelleges multo me vigilare acrius ad salutem quam te ad perniciem reipublicae. Dico te PRIORE nocte venisse inter falcarios — non agam obscure — in M. Laecae domum; convenisse eodem compluris eiusdem amentiae scelerisque socios. Num negare audes? quid taces? etc. — I, 8.

Fuisti igitur apud Laecam ILLA nocte, Catilina. — I, 9.

Reperti sunt duo equites Romani qui te ista cura liberarent et se ILLA ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem me in meo lecto interfecturos esse pollicerentur. — I, 9.

Failure to understand Cicero's use of these expressions is responsible for the effort to date the oration on the 8th. Evidently one of the first two expressions and all the rest refer to the night of the 6th of November. It may be well at the start to state that *superiore nocte* in I, 1 does not necessarily refer to the same night as *noctem illam superiorem* of I, 8 and *noctis superioris* of II, 6. *Each expression must be interpreted in its own context.*

If we assume, as we have a right to do from the evidence

presented above, that the oration occurred on the 7th, the *proxima* of I, 1 refers to the night of November 6th; and *superiore nocte* of the same passage was probably intended by Cicero to suggest some former night. It has no direct bearing on our problem.

But one asks, How could Cicero speaking on November 7th use *illam* (I, 8) of the night of November 6th? *Illam* does not here mean "that remote night," but "that night which I mentioned in the first part of my speech" (I, 1) — or the *nox* of I, 6. This use of *ille* is common and well attested.<sup>14</sup> After the exclamatory passage in I, 9 Cicero resumes the narrative, *Fuisti igitur . . . illa nocte*. Here *illa* may naturally refer to *priore nocte* of I, 8, to *nox* of I, 6, and ultimately to *proxima nocte* of I, 1. In *illa ipsa nocte* of I, 9 the point of view is that of the "two Roman knights" and the use of *illa* is regular regardless of the remoteness of the actual time involved.

Another *crux* is found in Cicero's use of *superiorem*. There is no good reason to think that this word could not be used on the morning of the 7th to refer to the night just past. Caesar so uses it:

Caesar exposito exercitu . . . cohortibus X ad mare relictis et equitibus CCC qui praesidio navibus essent, de tertia vigilia ad hostes contendit . . . ei praesidio navibusque Q. Atrium praefecit. ipse noctu progressus milia passuum circiter XII hostium copias conspicatus est. . . repulsi ab equitatu se in silvas abdiderunt. . . eos fugientes longius Caesar prosequi vetuit . . . quod magna parte diei consumpta munitioni castrorum tempus relinqui volebat. Postridie eius diei mane milites misit ut eos . . . persequerentur. His aliquantum itineris progressis . . . equites a Q. Atrio ad Caesarem venerunt qui nuntiarent *superiore nocte* maxima coorta tempestate prope omnes naves afflictas atque in litus eiectas esse. — *B. G.* v, 9 f.

In this account three days are involved. On the first day he established his naval camp, putting Atrius in command of the

<sup>14</sup> Ita fit verum illud, quod initio dixi. — *Lael.*, 65.

Harum trium sententiarum nulli prorsus assentior. Nec enim illa prima vera est. — *ibid.* 57.

Tertius vero ille finis. — *ibid.* 59.

Redeoque ad illud quod initio scripsi. — *Fam.*, I, 5, 7.

garrison. After midnight of the first and in the early morning of the second, Caesar marched twelve miles and engaged with the enemy, fortifying his camp in the afternoon. On the morning of the third day he had barely started his troops in pursuit of the enemy, when riders from Atrius came to report that on the previous night (*superiore nocte*) a storm had shattered the fleet. This could not have been "the night before last"; for on that night Caesar himself was at and near the camp till well into the morning of the second day. If the storm had come on the night of the first day, Atrius would not have waited 36 hours before informing Caesar, who was so near that he could be reached in an hour. Clearly then Caesar used *superiore nocte* early in the morning of the third day to refer to the night of the second day. This use of *superiore* by Caesar shows that Cicero, speaking on the morning of the 7th, could properly use *noctem illam superiorem* to refer to the night of the 6th.

There remains only the expression *priore nocte* (I, 8) to support the contentions of those who believe that the speech was delivered on the 8th. Cicero writing in December (*Fam.* I, 9, 26) uses *priore aestate* of the summer just past. This is parallel to the use of *priore nocte* on the seventh to refer to the night of the 6th. *Prior* and *superior* are used interchangeably by the Roman writers. Cicero clearly does this very thing in the passage before us, and again in *Pro Plancio* 53 f. The use of *priore nocte*, which is merely a variant for *superiore nocte* cannot justify the rejection of the direct evidence which points to the 7th as the date of the oration.

A careful analysis of the oration reveals the reason why Cicero intentionally used these ambiguous expressions. A less skillful orator might have blurted out at the start that he knew Catiline had been at Laeca's house, etc. But Cicero was a master in producing psychological effects. He purposely keeps his hearers in the dark as to the extent and exactness of his knowledge until he is ready to strike the killing blow, to which he comes with the words, "*non agam obscure.*" Up to this point he has twice startled Catiline and his associates by dark hints



that he knows their latest moves, but leaves them in doubt by harking back to more remote events. This will be obvious to anyone who will take the trouble to read the first ten sections of the speech. There is a fine point to this if we assume that the speech was delivered on the 7th, a few hours after the meeting at Laeca's house. But Cicero's procedure would be stupid if the oration was delivered twenty-four hours later, when Catiline would know that all Rome knew about his meeting and the unsuccessful attempt on the consul's life. Cicero asks Catiline if he does not know that he is held on all sides, intimating that Catiline does not yet know. This remark, appropriate on the 7th, would be superfluous on the 8th.

In the first passage he startles Catiline by asking who does not know where he was last night (Nov. 6th), but he immediately throws him off the track by asking about the night before and follows this up with detailed reference to events long past, reviewing in the worst possible light Catiline's previous career to prepare his hearers for the culmination of the climax. In Section 6 he gives Catiline another jolt: "Night does not conceal your wicked meetings; house walls do not confine the voices of your conspiracy; review your plans with me. October 21st . . . " (We can easily imagine Catiline saying to himself, "I almost thought he was going to tell where I was last night, but it is October 21st that he has in mind. Why should I worry?")

After passing November 1st in his review Cicero comes to the meeting of November 6th, alluding to it in the purposely ambiguous words, *noctem illam superiorem*. Then he pauses to say, "Now you will know that I am much more watchful for the safety than you are for the destruction of the state." By the morning of the 8th Catiline would have known this without being told, and there would be no point in Cicero's remark. Coming back to his point again Cicero uses the indefinite expression *priore nocte* to keep Catiline guessing until he speaks the word *Laecae*. Note how Cicero then gloats over the consternation which he has caused; how he follows it up with the

rapid *Num negare audes? quid taces?* culminating in the revelation that he saw right there in the senate some who had been with him. The effect produced by this unexpected disclosure is described by Cicero elsewhere.<sup>15</sup>

The argument for the 8th as the date of the first oration rests wholly on the assumption that the expressions *noctem illam superiorem*, *priore nocte*, and *illa nocte*, all of which clearly refer to November 6th, must mean "night before last" and could not have been appropriately used before the 8th. I have shown that this assumption is false, and that Cicero had very good reasons for using these ambiguous expressions in his speech. The state of affairs prevailing at the time of the speech as revealed in the oration itself was such as might be expected on the 7th, but would not obtain on the 8th. There is, therefore, no reason for ignoring or distorting such direct evidence as we have, all of which points unmistakably to the 7th of November as the date of the First Oration against Catiline.

<sup>15</sup> Quaesivi a Catilina in nocturno conventu ad M. Laecam fuisset necne. Cum ille homo audacissimus conscientia convictus primo reticuisset, patefeci cetera: quid ea nocte egisset, ubi fuisset, quid in proximam constituisset, quemadmodum esset ei ratio totius belli descripta edocui. Cum haesitaret, cum teneretur, quaesivi . . . — II, 13.

A nobis homo audacissimus Catilina in senatu accusatus obmutuit. — *Orator*, 129.

## TACITUS THE HISTORIAN

---

By LOUIS E. LORD  
Oberlin College

---

Publius Cornelius Tacitus was born about 54 A.D. — the year that Nero began to reign. He studied under Quintilian, the first Regius Professor of Rhetoric, and was prepared for the bar by the able jurists, Aper and Secundus. In 77 or 78 he married the daughter of the distinguished general Agricola. In 81 he became quaestor, in 88 praetor and in 97 consul. Between these latter dates he was, for four years, absent from Rome, probably serving as governor of some province of secondary importance. In 112 his official career was crowned by appointment to the Proconsulship of Asia, the highest position a private individual could occupy under the Empire. He died in 117. His life covers the reigns of Nero, that one long year (*unum et longum annum*) of Galba, Otho and Vitellius, the Flavian House, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian and the "most happy age" (*beatissimum saeculum*) of Nerva and Trajan. He was an accomplished lawyer and an able administrator, a distinguished man of affairs. In judging his historical work this should be remembered. His background of experience is like that possessed by such historians as Thucydides, Cromer, and Macaulay rather than Herodotus, Livy, and Grote.

Tacitus' earliest work was an essay on the decline of oratory, cast in the usual essay form, the dialogue. It is written in a beautifully clear, free style, modeled on Cicero. This probably appeared during the reign of Titus in 80. There followed a long interval during which Tacitus published nothing. Of this more will be said later. In 98 the *Agricola* appeared. It is a biography of his father-in-law, the conqueror and governor of Britain. Incidentally it contains a valuable résumé of the rela-

tions of Rome and Britain since the time when the divine Julius "discovered the island for his descendants but did not surrender it into their possession." During the same year the *Germania* was published. This is a monograph on the geography, ethnology, and customs of the Germans. It forms with Caesar's brief narrative in the sixth book of his *Gallic War* our earliest and by all means our fullest and best account of the primitive history of that debatable race.

These two works may be regarded as studies preliminary to his more elaborate historical compositions. The first of these was the *Histories* published from 105 to 109. It began with the fall of Nero and extended to the death of Domitian. Only the first five books, the last incomplete, are preserved. They carry the narrative into the year 70, closing with an account of the revolt in the Low Countries and the siege of Jerusalem by Titus.

The *Annals* appeared in 116. This work covers the reigns of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero. As the text has come down to us there is a great gap after Book VI covering the whole of the reign of Gaius and part of that of Claudius. The close of the narrative is also wanting.

Tacitus had intended to write the history of the reigns of Nerva and Trajan and of Augustus. There is no evidence that these intentions were ever fulfilled. But if his life had been prolonged to these onerous duties, *curae*, as he called them, he would have covered the whole period of the Roman Empire from its foundations to the death of Trajan. He actually completed the account from the accession of Tiberius in 14 to the death of Domitian in 96.

In these later histories Tacitus developed a style that is quite unique. It was founded on the style of Thucydides and more directly on that of Sallust but in its epigrammatic incisiveness, (exactly the opposite of the rich repleteness of Livy), it was carried to a point not reached by either of these writers. It is Sallust raised to the  $n$ th power.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the style of Tacitus nor his place in literature. That place is abundantly secure. As



a writer of historical prose he ranks with Livy, whose style was regarded by Macaulay and by H. A. J. Munro as the greatest prose style ever written.

As a historian apart from his claims as a literary artist Tacitus has, till quite recently, been considered one of the most keen observers and profound thinkers who have ever written on the deeds of mankind. Praise has been almost universal. Thus Gibbon says of Tacitus, that he was "the first of historians who applied the science of Philosophy to the study of facts."

In this connection it is always interesting to see what value one great historian places on the works of another. There have been few keener students of classical literature than Macaulay, and his characterization of the work of the ancient historians is particularly interesting, for it is a field in which he could speak with authority. It is true that he is not always kindly as when he says of Xenophon, "The very peculiarities which charm us in an infant, the toothless mumbling, the stammering, the tottering, the helplessness, the causeless tears and laughter, are disgusting in old age. In the same manner, the absurdity that precedes a period of general intelligence is often pleasing; that which follows it is contemptible. The nonsense of Herodotus is that of a baby. The nonsense of Xenophon is that of a dotard." Nor can we follow him when he says of Plutarch, "The heroes of Livy are the most insipid of all beings, real or imaginary, the heroes of Plutarch always excepted. Indeed, the manner of Plutarch in this respect reminds us of the cookery of those continental inns, the horror of English travelers, in which a certain nondescript broth is kept constantly boiling, and copiously poured without distinction over every dish as it comes up to table."

Of Tacitus Macaulay says, "Of the Latin historians Tacitus was certainly the greatest. His style, indeed, is not only faulty in itself, but is, in some respects, unfit for historical composition. He carries his love of effect far beyond the limits of moderation. He tells a fine story finely; but he cannot tell a plain story plainly. . . . In the delineation of character Tacitus is unrivaled

among historians and has few superiors among dramatists and novelists. By the delineation of character we do not mean the practice of drawing up epigrammatic catalogues of good and bad qualities and appending them to the names of eminent men. No writer has indeed done this more skillfully than Tacitus; but this is not his peculiar glory. All persons who occupy a large space in his works have an individuality of character which seems to pervade all their works and actions. We know them as if we had lived with them. Claudius, Nero, Otho, both the Agrippinas are masterpieces. But Tiberius is a still higher miracle of art. . . . The task was one of extreme difficulty. The execution is almost perfect."

This favorable estimate of Tacitus as a historian has been repeatedly attacked and in particular by Professor J. S. Reid in the *Journal of Roman Studies* for 1921. Speaking of this very essay of Macaulay on History, Professor Reid says that the charges which Macaulay brings against Livy could with greater truth have been affirmed of Tacitus. Livy, Macaulay says, "must be considered as forming a class by himself; no historian with whom we are acquainted has shown so complete an indifference to truth. He seems to have cared only about the picturesque appearance of his book, and the honor of his country. On the other hand we do not know, in the whole range of literature, of an instance of a bad thing so well done."

Professor Reid goes on to say that Tacitus as a historian is almost beneath contempt, because he is personal and partial, because his military chronicles are not lucid nor detailed and because he maketh and speaketh a lie.

Nor is Professor Reid alone in taking this gloomy view of the value of Tacitus' writings as history. For the last thirty years there has been a growing tendency to discredit his veracity.

This tendency seems to be due to two principal causes. In the first place the scientific spirit of the age requires of a historian more careful statements and greater precision of description. A recent writer in *Harper's Magazine* has entirely shattered the picture of Lord Chief Justice Jefferies and the Bloody

Assizes drawn by Macaulay. He has proved that Jefferies did not butcher innocent people in cold blood, but merely condemned several hundred people to death who were guilty of no offense whatever.

Beside such desirable accuracy of statement, scientific investigation has brought with it a certain scepticism that has become part of the spirit of the age. This is the attitude adopted during the last thirty years by those who have used the ancient historians as source material. How far this scepticism can mislead a historian is shown by Bury's treatment of Herodotus' account of the adventures of Histiaëus. Herodotus says that the revolt of the Ionian cities of Asia Minor was instigated by Histiaëus in order that he might be sent down from the Persian capital to the coast to quell that revolt. Bury says that Histiaëus could not have fomented the revolt with this expectation, for Darius would have been most unlikely to send him on such a mission. Yet this is precisely what Darius did, and the casual reader may be pardoned for suspecting that Histiaëus from his long residence at Darius' court in Susa may have been a better judge of his master's probable actions than even a scientifically trained historian.

Myths and legends are lifting up their heads again in the light of archæological discoveries. Excavations in Crete suggest that there is a kernel of truth in the Minos-Theseus legend. The *Iliad* is no longer a curious hodge-podge of tribal lays that, like Topsy, never was born but just "grewed." It is the poetic account of a historical struggle. Even Mr. Bury admits this in the second edition of his *History of Greece*. The study of comparative religion has proved that Xerxes' action in scourging the Hellespont for destroying his bridge, as Herodotus reports, was exactly the correct thing for him to do according to the *Persian Book of Common Prayer*, and that this is not a fiction invented by what modern writers would call Herodotus' diseased imagination, an imagination which leads a recent critic to class him with Boccaccio!

And for Tacitus I would plead that the stories he tells of

events, most of which happened during his own life time, must not be damned as lies or gossip simply because they are not accompanied by footnotes stating the chapter and verse of the authority. They are nearly all characterized by probability and it is well to remember Aristotle's exasperated warning, "There is no reason why some events that have actually happened should not conform to the law of the probable and the possible."

A second reason for dissatisfaction with Tacitus lies in the broadening conception of the field which history should cover. The modern historian must lay his foundations broad even if they are sometimes not deep. He must discuss sanitation by legislation and salvation by faith; the incidence of taxation on the masses and the incidents of tea-drinking among the classes. He must interest himself in the problems of architecture, domesticated and wild, in the prevalence of divorce, in the spread of luxury; in such questions as, "Does prohibition prohibit, and if so are you worse off than if it doesn't;" in education with its endless ramifications and sterile disputes; in all the *ologies* from philology to toxicology; in laborites, Edomites; trilobites and blatherskites. Not one of these does Tacitus mention.

And here I may as well admit the first charge that Professor Reid has made against him — that he is personal. If he were not, he would be no longer a historian; he would be merely an anachronism. For the ancient historians were largely biographers or autobiographers. Herodotus' history detaches itself into a series of sketches of the men who directed the Greek effort against Persia. Livy's "Second Punic War" is a biography of Hannibal and of Flaminius, Varro, Maximus, Marcellus, and Scipio. These are, of course, statements that must be made — and taken — with serious qualifications; but it can be affirmed with truth that Tacitus is no more personal or biographical than any ancient historian, with two exceptions, the incomparable Thucydides and the unreadable Polybius, of whom Gildersleeve used to say that he took great pains to avoid hiatus, but that there was one hiatus which he could not escape — the hiatus in the face of his readers.

And this charge of stressing the personal element cannot be brought with justice against the ancient historians only. Mr. Wells in his recent *Outline of History* gives one line to the career of Lincoln and two and a half pages to a description of his own study and his methods of historical composition — so called!

Yet this justification of personality in history does not satisfy the critics. Tacitus intimates that the Emperor Claudius was deficient in intellect — the philologists rejoin that he added new letters to the Roman alphabet. Tacitus explains that he was uxorious to the fifth degree, and the student of laws replies that when he was praetor he was indefatigable in holding court. Tacitus suggests that he was not a genius in the military art, and the archaeologists object that he built an aqueduct. These things Tacitus knew well enough but they did not fall within the ken of his work. He expressly says, (*Ann.* 13, 31) "One could fill volumes with the praise of the foundations laid and the timber used in the vast amphitheater erected by the emperor, but it has been found more in accordance with the majesty of Rome to record in historical works events that are of signal importance and commit topics like these to the daily journals."

In fact Tacitus is less personal than many among the ancient writers of history, and in estimating the justice of this charge it must be remembered that one of his historical monographs, the *Germania*, is almost entirely impersonal — more so than any passage in any ancient historian except the introductory chapter of Thucydides.

Tacitus is further criticised because his military accounts are neither accurate nor complete. This charge too has some basis in fact. Where military detail is necessary or pertinent it is furnished; where other facts are of greater historical value the military element is reduced to a subordinate and proper place.

Perhaps I can best make clear my meaning by two illustrations. The contest between Otho and Vitellius which is described in the second book of the *Histories* was fought on ground with which most of his readers were familiar — the region about Placentia. The description of this battle is so accurate and so clear that it



can be followed in all its details. Objection has been made even to this account by those who blame Tacitus for not speaking of the enveloping movement by which Vitellius so seriously embarrassed Otho. Tacitus does not use the term "envelop," nor does he speak of "first line trenches" nor "planes" nor "tanks" nor "cuties," but he describes the movements of the forces engaged with such accuracy that even a scientific historian can supply the proper terms. I believe that he used such great care in this case and similar instances, first, because the battle was of enough importance to deserve a detailed description, and second, because many of his readers were familiar with the locality and would be interested in the minutiae of the topography. It would be possible to mention many other instances of such complete description. When, however, the incidents of the battle are of less interest than the general conditions of the struggle, and especially where the locality is one unknown to his readers, he emphasizes the dramatic setting of the contest and its larger aspects. It is for this reason that the military critics find the operations described in the *Agricola* so disappointingly vague. Tacitus was writing for a public who knew little about the topography of Britain and cared less. He gives them a general idea of the size and shape of the island, a brilliant description of the people and the conditions under which the Roman occupation was accomplished, then he sketches in the military movements in bold strokes of vivid color. He pictures the battle on Mt. Graupius in which the natives were finally defeated by Agricola as Velasquez has pictured the surrender of Breda. Can you number Alva's army from the spear points on Velasquez's canvass? Not at all. But from these few soldiers so suggestive by the very indefiniteness of their number your mind reconstructs the scene, and the Spanish triumph rises before you infinitely more clear than it would have been in the painfully detailed accuracy of contemporary Dutch painting or the jejune annals of a militant military historian.

"But," the critic tearfully protests, "we don't even know where Mt. Graupius is!" True. Nor do you know whether it is Mt.

Graupius or Mt. Grampius. Nor does it greatly matter which it was nor where it is. Read the drama of the battle as Tacitus has described it. The calm resolve of a proud Roman general who staked his life and his honor on the courage of his men breathes again in the somber address of Agricola to his soldiers. "As for myself I long ago determined that retreat was safe neither for the army nor its leader; and indeed, as an honorable death is better than a life of disgrace, so safety and glory are indissolubly joined, and it will be no cause for shame to have fallen here at the edge of the world, at nature's end." The glowing passion for the wrongs of a free people reduced to Roman bondage has nowhere been more nobly expressed than in these words of the British leader, "(The Romans) are the despoilers of the world; since the land has failed them in their all-devastating course they are now scouring the sea also. Is the enemy rich? They are avaricious. Is he poor? They are ambitious. The lands of the rising nor the setting sun have sated their greed. They alone covet with equal concupiscence wealth and poverty. To harry, to murder, to plunder they falsely call a government, and where they create a desert they call it peace." This is not military history but it is something more precious and vastly more valuable for any serious student of history, either in Tacitus' day or in ours.

It is further objected that Tacitus is not impartial. And this charge I must wholly admit. It is true he claims to be impartial. In the opening chapter of the *Annals* he says, "It is my purpose to write briefly the closing events of Augustus' reign, next the reigns of Tiberius and the others without indignation or favor, for I have no cause for either." And again at the beginning of the *Histories*, "But those who profess fidelity to truth must speak of each individual without affection and without hatred" (*neque amore et sine odio*). Turn over a couple of pages and we find this description of the two most influential men at the court of Galba, "Titus Vinius and Cornelius Laco, the former the most despicable of mankind, the latter the most cowardly." This is certainly without affection, but it is hardly without hatred.

Many other instances could be found to parallel this. No, Tacitus is not an impartial historian. It is a fault that he shares with every other great historian who has recorded the acts of mankind at any great crisis in the affairs of the race — with one exception, the rare Thucydides. Consider the rôle for a moment. Herodotus and Livy are certainly open to the charge of favoritism — in fact this is their chief charm. Gibbon cannot be described as exactly sympathetic toward the failings of the Church. On one occasion he says, "The more serious charges against the Pope were therefore dismissed and the vicar of Christ was convicted of arson, murder, rape, adultery, and incest." Grote was an ardent Whig and interpreted the *Peloponnesian War* in the light of the debates in the house of Commons. Motley does not speak of Philip of Spain "*sine odio*," Macaulay's sympathies are not difficult to divine in his narrative, and Mommsen's aversion to Cicero and devotion to Caesar is a commonplace. Yet these are the great names in ancient and modern history.

I would like to raise the question, is not a certain amount of partiality necessary to the successful writing of history? The record of past performances seems to indicate that it is. For botany and biography are not written in the same way. The one is a list of facts; the other, to be worth anything, should be the record of emotions and purposes. It makes little difference whether Caesar was born, as an antiquated textbook quaintly puts it, "by common consent," in 100 B.C. or two years earlier. It makes an infinite difference what his ideals were, and what his motives in wrecking the fabric of the old republican government. And only that historian can fathom Caesar's motives and interpret his purposes who has read his life with sympathy, has fallen in some measure under the spell of his personality, and has come, albeit unwittingly, to number himself among Caesar's followers. To regard history as a mere correct chronicle of events is to reduce the historian to the place assigned him by Dr. Johnson, "The historian tells either what is false or what is true; in the former case he is no historian, in the latter he has no opportunity for displaying his abilities; for truth is one, and all who tell the truth must tell it alike."

The most serious indictment against Tacitus is that he deliberately falsifies his statements, and this I believe to be entirely untrue. Not that I would be understood to claim unvarying truth for 'Tacitus' statements. He is obviously misled at times.

For instance take his account of the Jews in the fifth book of the *Historics*. Tacitus says that the Jews were driven out of Crete and settled in Africa about the time that Saturn was expelled by Jupiter. This is, of course, literally true but not in the sense in which Tacitus meant it. He goes on to say that Moses was led to the spot where he drew water from the rock for the benefit of the children of Israel by a herd of wild asses and this is the reason why the ass is worshipped by the Jews. The wandering in the wilderness he reduces from forty years to six days, and thereby shows himself to be one of the first of the higher critics of the Old Testament.

It is not to passages like this that objection is made by 'Tacitus' critics but to the larger aspects of his work, to his portraits of Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, Domitian, and other worthies who have, in the opinion of some writers, undergone some sort of a sea change and have been suddenly converted from selfish egotists to radiant angels by the discovery that they were responsible for the laying of a few bricks or the government of a distant province with something less than the usual senatorial rapacity.

In such cases it is worth while to see what Tacitus actually does. Again let me give a concrete example. These are the *facts* about Agricola's death as given in 'Tacitus' biography. Agricola's fatal illness was a cause for universal anxiety and mourning. There was an unsubstantiated rumor of foul play. Officials and confidential physicians were sent from Domitian's palace to attend him. His condition was reported to the emperor by relays of runners. The emperor appeared grief-stricken. Later he was much pleased to learn that he had been named coheir in the will. Such are the *facts* as Tacitus himself gives them. Here is his narrative in Mr. Hutton's translation.

"The end of his life brought mourning to us, melancholy to his friends, solicitude even to the bystander and those who knew him

not; the great public itself and this busy preoccupied city came repeatedly to his doors and talked to him in public gatherings and private circles. No one on hearing of Agricola's death was glad nor at once forgetful. Commiseration was enhanced by the persistent rumor that he had been put out of the way by poison. I have no evidence on which to venture an assertion.

"However it be, throughout his illness came the chief freedmen and the confidential physicians of the Palace with a regularity unusual in a prince who visits by deputy, whether this was interest or espionage.

"When the end came every flicker of the failing life, it was well known, was chronicled by relays of runners and no one believed that men so grasp at news in order to regret the hearing. Yet in his face the Emperor paraded the semblance of a sorrowing heart, his hate was now no longer anxious, and it was his temperament to hide joy more easily than fear. It was well ascertained that on reading the will of Agricola, which named Domitian coheir with the best of wives and most dutiful of daughters, he exulted as in a verdict of honorable acquittal. So blinded, so perverted was his intelligence by unremitting flattery that he did not see that it is the bad prince who is made heir by good fathers."

You see at a glance what has happened. Every fact has been accompanied by a statement which has given it a distinct color. Over the whole narrative has been cast the gloom of the reign of Domitian as Tacitus experienced it. It is as if we were watching Agricola's life ebb away, and someone had interposed before our eyes a lurid red glass. It is not a question of falsifying the account but of coloring it; and this raises the question — and it is the all important question — Is the color correct? Is the picture true?

For myself I can only say that I sincerely believe that it is. All that we know of the character of Tiberius, of Nero, of Domitian, inclines me to believe that Tacitus is giving to these men the reputation which they bore in their own and in the immediately succeeding generation. And such reputations are on the whole deserved. Lincoln's dictum about the possibility of fooling all of the people all of the time is substantially correct.

Take any well-known character in history or any prominent



man of modern times. The characters of men like Gladstone and Morley are matters of common knowledge. The actions of these men are rightly interpreted in the light of this knowledge. To explain an act of Gladstone as due to greed, or one of Morley as due to jealousy would be unthinkable. When a historian speaks of the honesty of Lincoln or the fiery force of Clemenceau he is but recording that consensus of contemporary opinion which is well-nigh infallible. It is quite probably true that Franklin Pierce was a devoted husband, a kind father and a faithful attendant at church, but when Lord Charnwood says of him that "he might perhaps claim the palm among the presidents of those days for sheer deleterious insignificance" we know at once that the statement, though incapable of proof, is absolutely true for it reflects the unchallenged tradition of his own time.

But the critical historian will, I know, object to any coloring of fact. History must be reduced to a science — to a chronological record of uninterpreted actualities. And this raises the larger question, What is history? This is probably not the place to settle that question. Certainly the writer is not the person to answer it. But I would like to quote a paragraph from a recent article in the *Yale Review* on Papini's *Storia di Cristo*.

"A portrait of the historic Jesus which gave us a daily journal of his sayings and doings and left us cold would be not nearly so accurate as an utterly inaccurate chronicle which left us breathless and spent before His heroic and loving power."

That may not describe scientific history, but it is my ideal of what history should be. It was this sympathetic judgment of motives that Quintilian had in mind when he said that history was akin to poetry. Each is an interpretation (Aristotle would have said an imitation) of character, the one of real persons, the other of fictitious beings.

Let me once more make my meaning clearer by an illustration. The murder of Galba by Otho's followers is a sordid tale of an old man brutally slain, but Tacitus with his skillful brush has painted the scene so vividly that we see, as it were, a great tragedy enacted before our eyes on some vast stage. There were few in Otho's plot for Tacitus says, the people's

"feelings were such that a few dared to do this worst of crimes; more were willing that it should be done, and all allowed its perpetration." While the praetorian guard had already revolted, "Galba, meanwhile in ignorance and engaged with the sacrifices was wearying with his prayers the gods of an empire that had already passed to another." In the midst of the confusion as the soldiers of Otho charged into the Forum, Tacitus notes that the porticoes and the colonnades about were filled with spectators who silently looked on as at a performance in the arena. "No word was spoken by the people or the mob, but in awe they listened for every sound. There was neither tumult, nor yet quiet, but such a silence as betokens great fear and great anger." Could a picture be clearer? Did a painter ever use color with better effect?

Tacitus, to conclude, is a personal historian in so far as he centers his narrative about the great characters of the periods which he treats. For insignificant military details he substitutes significant historical settings. His partiality leads him to excoriate all that is mean and false in the sordid time of which he writes, and he makes the pages of history unfold before us like a panorama, by interpreting for us the acts of his characters in the true light of their own motives.

At the close of the *Agricola* there is a noble passage in which Tacitus begs the widow and the daughter to cherish within their hearts the lineaments of the soul and not of the body of the husband and father; "Not that I think," he says, "that portraits should be forbidden which are fashioned in marble and bronze, but as the countenance of a man is frail and mortal, so too is the image thereof. The form of the mind is eternal. And this you may not reproduce in an alien material nor by another's art, but only in your own character." So too will perish all the details of the mechanical chronicler and the structures of those who preach only the letter of the law that killeth. But the spirit of Tacitus that maketh alive abides, even as the memory of Agricola, "and shall abide in the hearts of men, in the procession of the ages, in the records of mankind," *in animis hominum, in aeternitate temporum, in fama rerum.*

## A DIALOGUE

By T. B. CHETWOOD, S. J.  
*Professor of Philosophy*  
Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.

### SCENE: *A Professor's Study*

*Piraeus*: Well met! my dear Cappy, good morning! *ave atque salve!*, and all that means a greeting. To what do I owe the honor of this visit?

*Capitolinus*: I am looking for something.

*P*. Something you can get here? Then it's found. Shall I wrap it up?

*C*. I'm not so sure I can have it. It's a vote.

*P*. A vote? — my vote?

*C*. Yes, your vote. I'll come to the point at once. I want to secure your vote for the suppressing of Greek in the undergraduate curriculum.

*P*. Ah, Cappy, Cappy! you know I have convictions there, dear, deep convictions. You can't ask me to vote them away.

*C*. But let us deal with your convictions. What are they?

*P*. They are precisely the contradictory of this vote you come to solicit.

*C*. What are your objections?

*P*. I have no objections. It is you who object to my convictions.

*C*. I do, and I can give my reasons.

*P*. Let's have them, Cappy dear, if you are so disposed.

*C*. I object to having Greek continue on the undergraduate curriculum because it overloads it, because all the purpose that the learning of a classical language serves is amply and superabundantly served by Latin.

P. Good! we have common ground to start on. Let us begin. I know you are well furnished for argument. Tell me now why you think Latin should have a place in the undergraduate curriculum?

C. Is it possible that you wish me to defend this? You who have stood out so strongly for the retention of Greek and, as I thought, a fortiori for Latin, too. Have you swung to the other pole?

P. Consider me so, Cappy. Sit down. Talk to me as to a radical and a modernist in education. Let me have hot and spontaneous your weightiest reasons for the use of Latin as a modern educator. You know there are those who oppose it and support their opposition with reasons.

C. Not with real reasons, with sophistries which wear a speciousness depending entirely on ignorance of the very meaning of education. For education means nothing if it does not mean two things:—first, the communication of information; this is what I might call the gross element, the mere packing the receptive mind with ideas; secondly, education is the development of the faculty for order or more properly, coördination, the faculty of *arranging* what we know in its relation of parts to the whole. These two factors in education are elemental, but the second is by far the more important. For information the young mind will get by hook or crook. It will inhale it as the plant inhales the air; but order must be taught, inculcated. Youth is, by natural proclivity, disorderly in its mental as in its bodily nourishment, trusting blindly to a powerful digestion to dispose somehow of what it swallows. Now a language, especially a highly evolved language like the Latin, is a mighty masterpiece of order. It is a collection of rules, rules great and small all united by one governing purpose, all converging on one effect—the more accurate expression of thought. No one can master a language, I mean of course a great language, without being educated, I had almost said utterly and sufficiently educated thereby.

P. Well said and well set forth, Cappy. It will need a shrewd

and profound disputant to reply to that argument. But, tell me, have you no further reasons in your plea for Latin? You surely have.

C. The next reason is a simple one, simple in its statement but well-nigh limitless in its application. It is the learning, the building up of one's own language from having to translate into one's own language from the Latin. Have you ever realized that we have a proof of this, a palpable overwhelming proof before our eyes and on our lips every day of every year? You know well, no one better, that our English tongue is lineally descended from a Low German dialect spoken by the half-barbarous tribes that crossed the channel into Britain in the fifth century. You know equally well that the development of nearly fifteen centuries has made the English tongue as different from the primitive Saxon as stuttering baby-talk is from the phrasing of a finished orator. Whatever homely strength there was in the original tongue has been retained but what an almost immeasurable gain can we count! What swiftness! what subtlety! what grace! What ability in our tongue to measure up to the needs of the refining of mighty minds and the reaches of sublime thoughts! And how has this been accomplished? How has our language been elevated, metamorphosed from a country-clout to a courtier, a jurist, a metaphysician and a minstrel all in one? You must answer: — by the infusion into our language of Latin or so-called Romanic elements. But how did these elements come to be adopted? Almost entirely from the translation of Latin into English. For when Latin was read and rendered even though the rendering was only mental it was found that the Saxon would not measure up to it. Words were wanting to parallel the Latin, and so the Latin word was captured and set to work. And those Latin words side by side with their Saxon companions have built up a tongue which Jacob Grimm places ahead of every language ancient and modern. Some one may object here that if our language is made, it is made, and there is nothing left to do but possess it in peace. Nay, but when does a man *possess* his native tongue? Only when he has ransacked



its resources, when he has sounded its depths. And, as far as training can take the place of genius, and method can supply for mood, there is no way so sure of mastering all the riches of one's own tongue as to be obliged by translation to make it measure up to a tongue so rich and resourceful as the Latin. How the translator will have to search and turn over stones, so to speak! He may even carry forward the work of the earliest translators and leave his native tongue a little richer than he found it. I remember how this came home to me like a flash of revelation when I found in an advanced dictionary the word, "Philippize," which is the only way of translating the word used by Demosthenes to express —

P. Hold a little there! You are betrayed by your enthusiasm into a plea for *another* tongue than the Latin. You have fairly established a second reason in defense of Latin. Have you no more?

C. More I have. Listen. The third reason is what I might call an historical reason. Here we are, the products of a civilization which is called European. For better or for worse, Christendom or Christian Europe is our mother. She redeemed our ancestors from savagery and lifted them up and clothed and taught them. Her language was Latin, the language of her laws, of her medicine, of her arts, of her letters. Even centuries after the redemption of our ancestors from barbarism, Latin remained the living tongue of learned men in Europe. The learning of ten centuries and more in Europe is locked up in Latin. If there were any men of thought whom Latin did not both form and inspire, at least they were formed and inspired by those whom Latin had formed. Shakespeare's "little Latin" is often quoted. But remember the words are Jonson's, a supreme Latinist, and amount to an admission that the most native of all geniuses was not without a substantial knowledge of Latin. Wide throughout all the plays of the mighty Bard runs, first, a profusion of Latin-English words working their eternal effect shoulder to shoulder beside the pure Saxon. Second, there is found almost at every step evidence of a knowledge

of the history, the classics and the classic lore of Rome. Whether this is had at first or second hand is of minor importance. John Milton as you know was a Latinist. There are —

P. You needn't go on. That point is fairly established. What next?

C. Next comes what I shall call an argument from Conservatism. I must pause and speak a few words on the force or attitude of mind which is set counter to conservatism. It is called radicalism or — we have a splendid new word for it with lurid associations — Bolshevism. It is aptly set forth in one of the novels of Turgenieff, in which he makes the hero say, "*There is not a single modern institution, religious, economic, or political which cannot be best improved by being utterly destroyed.*" Radicalism would cancel the past and all its findings, rub the face of the world clean of the last vestiges of civilization and then write an entirely new story. Though no one can conceive, itself least of all, what that story is to be. Once turned loose it would not leave a roof over our heads nor, for that matter, our heads safe upon our shoulders. Against all this stands the might, the bulwark, the inspiration of Conservatism. Conservatism is the very soul of permanence. It is no enemy of reform. It only bids reform forbear to clear the ground of good foundation — or to blast away the very earth and expect to raise an edifice on unsubstantial air. Conservatism does not oppose progress. But it only bids Progress keep the window that opens on the past clear, so that the light of the past, its achievements and its lessons may shine along the future. Don't you see what I'm getting at? Nothing is more beneficial for us — nothing more wholesome for our youth in this age of radicalism, than that they should grow up with a reverence for the past, in the habit of consulting the past. No great invention, no great leap forward of Progress but began from a foundation it found ready laid for it. Suppose Watt, who changed the face of the world with his steam engine — suppose in place of his teakettle with its quivering lid, he had nothing but a primitive cauldron with a yawning top and no cover, he might never have guessed at the

marvel of steam. We build on the Past. We reshape the tools of the Past. But nowhere is so much of the wisdom of the Past crystallized for all time as in the language of the Past. There it is, whole and entire, in the Latin.

P. I feel you have only paused for breath, Cappy.

C. I have kept my Achilles for the end. You, of all men, you can feel him coming, you can see the far-flashing armor and hear the shout that through the long centuries has never grown inarticulate. I refer to the undying beauties of the Latin Classics: the majesty of Vergil and his rich sonorous verse, the eloquence of Cicero, that made even Caesar tremble and turn pale, the exquisiteness of Horace and his searching knowledge of men, Juvenal's silver tongue chimes like a bell for all —

P. Then there are two excellent historians, eloquent too in places, Tacitus and Livy. Ovid was a gentle singer and Lucretius's philosophic verse is by no means to be despised. As for plays, — well, there were things by Plautus and Terence. Have we omitted any really great names? You will not, I think, be earnest about Propertius and Tibullus or even Catullus; and Lucan's *Pharsalia* is a rather windy creation. Nepos, Phaedrus, and Sallust pretty much close the column, do they not?

C. Oh names, mere names are nothing. You interrupt my argument with your erudition. What I mean is what the name stands for, particularly those great names I mentioned. The great truth to be insisted on is that there is a peculiar appeal in a great work of art when it comes to light from my own digging — trait by trait, feature by feature till the whole gazes at me with undimmed eyes across the centuries. And I, I have unearthed it from a foreign tongue. Why, it makes the student realize the kinship of genius for all time and in all the world; the oneness, the pathetic oneness of the destiny of humankind, of its falterings, of its failures, of its glorious triumphs. For the tears of Dido were of the same salt as our own, and the blood of Nisus and Euryalus was as warm and red. So the melody of Horace and his pictures of breathing life and human effort. The argument comes to its height when you realize that these artistic beauties are not only great and

worthy but the greatest and the worthiest of all time, — to know them is a life experience, to be ignorant of them a cause for lifelong mourning. Where is there a Vergil today or a Horace or a Cicero? The last name makes me pause in spite of myself; for it is the name of him who with the torrent of his eloquence swept Pompey into command, high over the cavils of faction, who paralyzed the arms of Catiline and his crew and buried the mighty Antony beneath an ocean of scorn so scalding that we almost at this distant day draw back our very feet from it in terror. Time will never cool it. It is —

P. You overwhelm me, Cappy; you almost scald me into flight. But listen to one interpellation, and then I shall sum up your argument, which I have noted with the frankest admiration. What I want to inquire about is this: How far would you maintain that the benefit derived from the study of a classical language is universal? How about dull-wits? Education is for all. Just as all must eat, so all must learn and no mind that grows but can be helped by training it and watering its roots from the stream of selected knowledge. But is Latin for all and, if so, how much Latin for all?

C. That is a real problem that must be, partially at least, solved in the schoolroom. But the general answer is "Latin for all." I exclude half-wits. They require expert and separate attention. I do not exclude dull-wits. There is, of course, something in the division of minds into patrician and plebeian, those that spring at learning and grasp it as if with a born right, and those that sweat painfully under its burden and oftentimes spill a portion of it. But this division is yet a most dangerous one. For it may discriminate against the so-called "dull-wit," who may be absorbing slowly but building more surely than his schoolmate quick-wit. Nay, I repeat, all who are capable of taking an education should take Latin as a prominent element of their education. I could even wish we could enforce the old English system of making part of a primary education the mastering of the "bones" of Latin, the inflections and the verb forms. The Jesuits have or had a delightful facility of making

the conquest of the "bones" the subject of games and classroom battles. Then the way is cleared for approaching the soul of the language itself in the higher classes. But the great principle is that one who has wits cannot but benefit by having them ordered by the discipline of a great tongue, by having them enlarged into the grasp and mastery of his own tongue, by having them sobered with reverence and deference for a great past by having them refined and inspired — inspired is the word — by contact with the monuments, the peaks of human thought found in the Latin Classics. I read a most interesting work by the Abbé Dimnet lately, in which he quotes testimonies from those who deal with the youth of modern France in the advanced schools not alone of the Arts but of the Sciences and the Professions as well, all deploring the evident retrogression and decay of youthful French acumen from an earlier day (*France Herself Again* — pp. 332 ff.). They all attributed it to the modern lapse from the study of Latin. I —

P. I read that book, too. But tell me does not the excellent Abbé mention Greek, too?

C. He — he — now that I come to think of it —. Anyhow, if he does, I reject that part of his argument and hold fast to what he says as applying to Latin alone.

P. But I, I, Cappy, hold fast to his whole statement as applying to Greek, as well as to Latin and I'm going to prove it to you, Cappy. You have given me the reasons sorted out and sharpened. Sit there while I use them on you. You shall be "hoist with your own petard."

In the first place, I shall be fair and grant you there is an advantage enjoyed by Latin that is not shared by Greek. That, I mean, of entering into our native tongue as a component part of it. That Greek *does* somewhat enter in you know; — that it has been borrowed from liberally to enrich the finished English of modern times. Then, too, I admit there is the historical advantage of Latin. Greek was never a living tongue in Christendom. Nor was it the tongue to which the scholars of western civilization for a thousand years committed their findings and



their thoughts. If the great Eastern Empire had not decayed and fallen — but we shall not deal with suppositions. The fact remains that Greek was not the living tongue of learned Europe. But does the Greek then hold a place subordinate to the Latin? Nay, but I fairly hold that the Latin tongue can wear no nobler title than that of handmaid to the Greek. First take the linguistic structure of the Latin which as you so well said is an invaluable means of teaching order to the youthful mind. So closely akin are the two tongues that to have learned the linguistic forms of Latin is to have more than half learned Greek. One opens naturally into the other, and the lesson of order in the Latin tongue will be reaffirmed and confirmed and carried higher by a mastery of the Greek, which as you know is a far more perfect tongue. As to what you say about translation, Cappy, in your enthusiasm for a superb argument you are led into some exaggeration. That the presence of Latin or Romanic words in our language is “almost entirely” due to translation is a statement not borne out by history. You forget the fusion of the original Saxon with the Norman French of England’s eleventh-century conquerors. This mating with a Romanic tongue undoubtedly opened the way for the more easy adoption of Latin words than had taken place in the pure Saxon. But there is a great point that you miss, or fail to emphasize, Cappy. When a language becomes more ample by the adoption of new words or even by the incorporating of a whole new language into its substance, it does not at once become richer and greater in the living literary sense. It is no greater than the greater of the two languages which compose it. And there was not (it may be fairly held) much to choose between the Saxon and the Norman French. New words were at first a mere convenience like “Church” and “monastery” and “Baptism” found in the primitive Saxon. They were technical words representing a new form of learning. They could easily have been given equivalents in the Saxon but a new learning likes to create a nomenclature of its own to keep it from confusion with the vulgar speech and also to make it catholic to other tongues in which the

same learning is found. This becomes much clearer in modern times in all the *ologies* and *isms* that swell our dictionary nigh to bursting. "Biography" could just as well be "life-tale" as autobiography could be "self-tale." The fusion with Norman French was a mere political social and commercial convenience. And its first effect was to give two words for one. "Motherly" and "maternal" were distinguished by different ancestry but by no more. It is only when the writers come, the great and the small, that they touch the words and make them live and sing together in one tongue. It is they who find in the pedantry of "maternal" a literary value distinct from the direct pathos of "motherly" and "biography" has a value distinct from "life-tale" not least for its sound and syllabification. The subtlety and the swiftness, and the grace and rhythm come to words and through words to a language when these same words have made vocal the moods of writers and of singers. When old Shakespeare speaks of two swimmers "stemming" the torrent "with hearts of controversy," can't you hear the Latin and Saxon sing together? But your argument, Cappy,—in the main it is sound and splendid. There is no way so sure of mastering the resources (the *literary* resources) of one's own tongue as to be obliged by translation to make it measure up to the resources of a rich literature. Note well,—the *richer the better*. As to your diatribe against Bolshevism, you might be misunderstood to say that whoever is not a Classicist is a Radical. But *I* know what you mean. You mean that there is no bulwark against Radicalism so strong as education in a reverence for the achievements of the past and no education in such reverence equal to the study of the language in which a mighty past is crystallized. But what comparison in the world of intellect is there between the achievements of Greece and those of Rome. Rome, rough, soldierly world-builder, was the humble pupil of Greece whose mighty past stretched back nearly a thousand years before. I waive the question as to whether the Greek is the parent language of the Latin or even an elder child of the same parent stock, but that Greek Literature is the parent of Latin Literature, of this

there can be no question. The literary lives of the great men you mentioned all begin in the same way. They were educated in the schools of Greece, in Athens or Rhodes or elsewhere, under Greek masters; their first literary efforts were translations from Greek models. Cicero's philosophic works which were surely the fruit of his mature and deliberate genius are little more than paraphrases or compilations of the works of Greek authors. Horace, whose earliest ambition was to write Greek verse, borrowed all his forms from the Greek and constantly reproduces the language as well as the thoughts of his Greek masters. Vergil was little more than a splendid imitator. And remember these men carried the Latin language to its zenith. It was they who gave it what character and position it has as a great tongue. A few generations before them Latin did not exist as a literary language. It can be said to have no independent literary origin of its own. If you wanted to put the thing rather strongly you could say that Latin is not only the literary child but the literary parasite of Greek. You have spoken with unanswerable truth of the debt of our English to the Latin. But the debt of Latin to Greek is, unanswerably, many times greater. And if, as you have made so clear, our English tongue rightly appreciated, points to the Latin, first as its kind patron and afterwards as its life partner, is it less true that the Latin points to the Greek? Why it is so striking that I conceive the ancient Latin tongue as a tall finely wrought guidepost on the broad highway of letters, pointing to the Greek which lies hard by at the end of the road where guests can find a long, sweet rest and refection. And yet you, Cappy, would have the young pilgrims throw down their packs and sprawl about the ground, their journey done, at the guidepost. When I come to your last argument words are difficult. You speak and you speak well of the eternal beauties of the Latin masters, but what are they beside the Greek? — as mere molehills that hardly cast a shadow, to mountains that support the sky with clouds about their waists and sun-bathed crests that have never, never worn a shadow. What is the "scalding eloquence" of Cicero — I had almost in an unworthy mood called

it scolding eloquence — beside Demosthenes? Cicero did not make a lost cause won for all time by the almost audible voice of the hero dead who came in awful jury at his call. There they stand, their armor battered and dusty, but their eyes undimmed and their great wounds red and pleading. Vergil was a great singer, but his men and women with their rhythmical speeches and sentiments — will they not be silent when Homer's men and women speak? when Helen shades her eyes and searches for her brothers among the chieftains under the walls? when Hector, braver than fate, kisses his sweet wife and when his baby son shudders at his glancing helmet, takes it off that he may kiss him too? and when the terrible battle-cry of the son of Peleus screams across the Scamander, and when the Aged Priam bows over the great hands that reft him of his dearest? Horace could touch the shell like a true minstrel, but he will sit down rapt and still, when Theocritus breathes a long, low note — or Alcaeus or Sappho. And if Pindar raises his voice, the Latin poet will shout or weep or caper about, the mere slave of his song.

Then there is so much that does not even find a faint echo in Latin. The well-nigh fathomless wisdom of Plato and yet wrought into words of melting loveliness! Listen to his old master, Socrates, as he makes the laws of Athens plead their sanctity. Their words "boom"; βουβει is the Greek word. You are deaf if you do not hear it. Then there are the Greek dramatists, masters of that art which includes all the others, gathering up, perhaps, all the greatness of Greek literature in the epic power of their dialogue or in the lyric marvel of their chorus — Prometheus with the vultures whose talons cannot reach his courage, Oedipus wrestling with fate and thrown, yet wonderfully up-raised in the end. But I must not go on, for night will find us still talking. What I want to say in closing is that I am only feebly echoing the message of Latin literature itself. It points with the plainest gesture back to the Greek, Livy and Tacitus point to Thucydides; Vergil points to Homer; Cicero points to Demosthenes, yes, and to Plato, too; Horace, thorough gentleman that he is, holds out two graceful arms towards Pindar and the eternal

group that companion him; while the Latin dramatists, though they have done almost nothing else worth mentioning, still take us by the hand and lead us reverently into the presence of their Greek masters. But you will not be led, Cappy. You put down your two feet like a froward child. "Here I will stick," you say. What is that? You will revise your request for my vote? Here's my hand, Cappy, — Yes, indeed, this long spell of talking and listening, would exhaust anyone. Don't stir. I will ring.



## A FEW PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE *RATIO STUDIORUM*<sup>1</sup>

---

By CLEMENT J. FUERST, S.J.  
St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas

---

The *Ratio Studiorum* is a method and system of studies, elaborated between the years 1584 and 1599 by the careful study of a cosmopolitan committee of professors and from the practical, collective experience of hundreds of teachers in the Jesuit schools of the sixteenth century. The *Ratio* is not a scientific treatise of pedagogical principles; it is rather a codex of rules and regulations that prescribe for officials and teachers the curricula and teaching methods to be followed in the courses of theology, philosophy, and literature. With the dawn of the scientific age a revision in the branches of study was made in 1832; otherwise the document of 1599 remains substantially and essentially intact. Today, on account of the changed conditions of education, we abide not so much by the letter of the *Ratio* as by its spirit. A cursory study of but one aspect of the *Ratio*, viz., its principles and characteristics in regard to the teaching of Latin, may help to explain the undisputed success that the *Ratio* enjoyed when the entire system could be put into practice, and at the same time may serve to corroborate some of our modern, approved methods.

The most characteristic and typical feature of the *Ratio* is the so-called prelection or explanation beforehand of every assignment that is given to the student. The prelection aims to open up the subject to the student, to adapt the matter to his understanding, and to point to the solution of difficulties, so that the pupil in his home study will find the lesson attractive and inter-

<sup>1</sup> Read at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of Kansas and Western Missouri, Kansas University, April 17-18, 1925.

esting in the conscious knowledge that the assignment has been made agreeably digestible. Its purpose is not to save the student painstaking labor, nor to furnish him with information that with application he can readily secure for himself. Discouragement overtakes the less talented and the less diligent when they are forced to plod on unaided, and the use of illegitimate helps proves irresistible; the more diligent students, on the other hand, often labor long and fruitlessly over difficult passages, that might have been made easy by an explanatory remark of the teacher.

In the *Ratio* the prelection constitutes a cardinal and all-pervading principle. It is twofold; the one is applied to the interpretation of the author; the other to the explanation of the rules of grammar in the lower classes, and of the precepts of poetry, rhetoric, and style in the higher classes. Though the prelection of the author always proceeds along certain definite lines, still it necessarily varies according to the scope of the respective classes and in accordance with the matter under consideration. In general a prelection of a speech of Cicero would include the following points:

First, the advance passage, unless it be too long, is read by the teacher with an attempt at expressing the sense and spirit of the original. Besides indicating to the student the grouping of the phrases and the sentiment of the passage, this reading is intended to accustom the pupil to the rhythm of the language.

Next, the teacher sketches the argument or gist of the advance lesson succinctly, its connection with the preceding, and its place and purpose in the whole of which it forms a part. This relation is frequently missed by the student in the piece-meal progress of the daily advance.

The third step in the process is the consideration of the meaning, structure, and connection of the individual sentences. Attending to the proficiency of the class and the nature of the textbook used, the teacher will briefly clear up any difficulty that may prove too great a challenge to the pupil's effort. Special stress will be laid on those phrases and sentences that strikingly illustrate the precepts that form the specific work of the class.

In the lower classes these observations will be limited to remarks on etymology, syntax, the force and propriety of words, and variety of idioms; in the most advanced classes, which have an aesthetic appreciation of the classics as their objective, Latin is to be taught as literature. Hence the professor will try to point out, as he proceeds from one structural part to another, the orator's skill in holding the attention of his hearers, the reasoner's force of argument, the artist's facility of amplification, his emotional versatility. In inspiring, vivid language he will try, if possible, to rouse the student's imagination to project and visualize for himself the brilliant, animated images on the pictured page; he will evolve and revivify metaphors by illustrations drawn from familiar objects; he will show the beauty, life, and order of the masterpiece, and reveal the master's great conception; in fine, he will endeavor to disclose behind the veil of language the joys, the sorrows, the passions, the writer's noble emotions, that they may thrill the pupil, stir and inspire him. It is an artistsic study with the class coöperating; not every passage will offer the same possibilities of aesthetic presentation; the specific treatment will depend upon the nature of the passage and the capabilities of the teacher. Modern textbooks, though replete with grammatical and historical lore, lend little suggestion towards an aesthetic interpretation of the classics.

The prelection proper need not be long; a more elaborated and detailed elucidation will be given in the next class after the student has worked over the passage in his home study. The prelection of a historian can, as a rule, be limited to a brief explanation of the course of events with a running commentary on obscure expressions. In the poets the principles of poetry, the laws of poetic diction, and consideration of metre will be accentuated. It may often be expedient to change poetic figures into prose figures and set forth the difference between the two kinds of style.

Notes and observations of a historical and eruditional nature are to be doled out in class in sparing doses, lest the author be lost in a mass of historical, archaeological, and critical details,

which can easily be supplied in the literary clubs and academies.

It is clear that, with a prelection to precede each lesson, the reading of the author must be slow and thorough. It is a case of "*non multa, sed multum*."

In formally explaining the rules of grammar and the precepts of style and expression the *Ratio* applies its favorite maxim, *pauca praecepta, plurima exempla, frequentissima exercitatio*. One precept will be elucidated at a time and dwelt on for several days in succession, if somewhat difficult, to give it time to sink deeply and take lasting hold; for, as an old pedagogue put it, the spirit of young folk is like a narrow-necked vessel which rejects liquid poured on in torrents, but which receives what is poured in drop by drop. After making clear the sense of the precept, the teacher will adduce many sentences and phrases from the best authors to illustrate the rule; finally he will give it a practical turn by incessant application in composition work.

The counterpart of the prelection is the repetition. The repetition is a review of the prelection; what was emphasized in the explanation, is insistently accentuated in the review. The old adage, *Repetitio est mater studiorum*, became the second vital point in our system. The *Ratio* is satisfied if fewer truths be acquired, provided that they be engraved deeply in the mind; but it likewise assures us that truths sink deeper if they are often repeated. Repetition is enjoined at every stage. A repetition is to follow every prelection; it is the surest test that the teacher's meaning was grasped by the pupil; the pupil, too, is accustomed to attend to the salient points of an elaborated explanation. A daily review of yesterday's lesson opens every class; on Friday the work of the week is rehearsed synoptically; when by the end of the term a whole speech has been covered, a retrospective view is taken for a fuller appreciation of the whole in relation to its several parts; finally at the commencement of each year the previous year's matter is briefly recalled in rapid review.

The interpretation of the author and the intelligent grasp of the precepts of grammar and style are but the body of the prelection; imitation is the soul; this imitation is embodied in com-

position work. So essential to a ready knowledge of Latin does the *Ratio* hold the writing and correcting of themes that it recommends it as a daily exercise and by it measures proficiency in all classes. For effective imitation the theme, the *Ratio* contends, must be based upon the author studied in class and be a reflex of the precepts, idioms, and figures insisted on in the prelection. Composition work based upon the author not only ensures a practical working knowledge of theoretical precepts and accustoms the pupil to the word-order and phrase-grouping of the rythmical Latin period, but also indirectly reacts upon the author-study; for, a thorough knowledge of the passage imitated will be an indispensable requisite for correct composition work. The theme, then, is but another mode of the ever varied and constant process of repetition.

The subject-matter of the theme, though modeled upon the author read in class, is moulded according to the exigencies of the class and the ingenuity of the teacher.

Important as is the writing of compositions, no less imperative is the correcting of the pupil's work in or out of class, since the correction of past errors is the surest stepping stone to progress. In the correction the teacher is merely to indicate what is wrong, crude, or inappropriate, leaving the student to amend his own mistakes.

As competition is the life of the business world, so rivalry is the life of a class. The *Ratio* fully valued the powerful incentives of praise and honor on the one hand and of shame and blame on the other to spur students on to emulation. Students, as a rule, need all the motives of study that they can command. Without emulation men sink into mediocrity. To foster honest rivalry in a class is to instill life and action into the pupils, to rouse them to continued exertions without conscious fatigue, to inject enthusiasm into the often dull but necessary drill work. In the *Ratio* emulation is fostered in the lower classes by giving each student his rival; both will be mutually on the alert to detect each other's mistakes in all written and oral exercises. Again, the classes may be divided into two sides, which are frequently styled



camps or armies, with their respective leaders, who keep record of the points gained. Two classes, likewise, may contend with each other on common ground in the presence of one or more visitors.

Praise and blame are effective instruments for good. Skilfully used, they are productive of wonderful results. A word of praise for excellence or diligence, a favorable comment written at the end of an exercise well done, the practice of grading all written work, the giving of notes for daily recitation, the public exhibition on the class bulletin board of superior compositions, the use of a pupil's theme as a model for the class, are some of the incentives at the command of every teacher.

For the successful in all contests as well as for superior merit in class work the *Ratio* prescribes public recognition and rewards. In Jesuit schools today there is public reading of class grades at a general assembly four times a year. At each reading first- and second-honor ribbons are awarded from the platform by the highest official of the school. At the end of the year gold medals are bestowed on class leaders, bronze medals or books on all with a grade above eighty-five, and frequently praemiums on the students who ranked first in the individual subjects of their respective classes.

The ambition of the aspiring youth is finally realized when he is admitted into the so-called academy, an exclusive literary society made up of a select, talented, and industrious aristocracy. Its purpose is to complement and expand the work of the class by criticism and appreciation of literary topics, the discussion of disputed questions of literature and extensive reading in the Latin classics.

Whatever can arouse interest in serious study and spur on the student to ever increased efforts, is worthy of the educator's attentive consideration. Honest emulation, praise, prizes, and rewards are no insignificant stimuli for the average youth.

These characteristic exercises of the *Ratio*, the prelection, the repetition, composition, and emulation are calculated to make the study of Latin inviting by smoothing its difficulties, by making

the student see and feel his progress and by furnishing him with impelling motives. While they presuppose an energetic and enthusiastic teacher, they demand of the student earnest and consistent work in and out of class. Sugar-coated methods, which teach more about Latin than Latin itself, may make the class hour pass pleasantly, but sooner or later we must face the grim, inevitable truth that there is no highroad to the acquisition of Latin. Study and serious study is the only path to success. *Labor vincet omnia.*

NOTE. — Acknowledgment is due for help received from treatises on the *Ratio* by Frs. Swickerath, Hughes, and Magevney, and from articles in the *Woodstock Teachers Review*.

## A TRIBUTE TO HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN

---

By ANDREW F. WEST  
Princeton University

---

The elaborate report of Dr. Leon B. Richardson, Professor of Chemistry in Dartmouth College, embodies the results of an inquiry into the present condition of college studies in response to a request from the President of Dartmouth College. On pages 42 and 43 Professor Richardson strikingly analyzes and emphasizes the principal intellectual and moral reason why Latin is so important in preparation for success in college studies generally. Here are his words, — and remember they come not from a professor of classics but from a professor of science:

"In fact, the presence of Latin in the curriculum of the high school is the saving grace of the situation. A measure of indulgence will, I think, be granted to a teacher of chemistry by his classical colleagues if he greets with a certain ribald mirth some of their claims of results which come from the study of Latin. But it is clear to most people, even to chemists, that the study of Latin gives four years of thorough training, calling for mental concentration and effort; that it is a 'tough job' and that it is within the capacity of the school to see that it is 'well done'; and that it is almost the only subject remaining in the high-school curriculum of which that can be said. The greater success in college work which, as a class, those students who enter with the classical training achieve over those who do not have it, is to be attributed not so much to the nature of the subject as to the fact that it has presented a task which has required concentration and hard effort for its solution. So other hard tasks are attacked with less mental shrinking and are carried through with more resolution."

It is a gratifying tribute from an independent investigator. The "nature of the subject" is of course only one element, though an important element in the value of Latin. But a subject which requires "concentration and hard effort" is evidently a subject much needed in our American education.

## CLASSICAL BACKGROUND

---

By ALBERT BILLHEIMER  
Gettysburg College

---

Recently a serious effort was made to analyze the condition of the classics as taught in our secondary schools. We have looked carefully into objectives, content, and methods. All this is as it should be. However, when the last word shall have been said concerning these phases of teaching, in the final analysis the condition of the classics will depend upon the attitude of the pupils toward the subject. For the time has come in the arrangement of curricula when not only is the study of the classics voluntary, but easier optional subjects present an increasingly alluring appeal. Even those who elect the classics must be held to the course against many contrary influences. And the attitude of the pupils depends very much upon the spirit with which the teacher presents the subject. For, while the character of the objectives, content, and methods is of primary importance in the mind of the educator for the attainment of the best results, actually it is the personal appeal of the subject as made through the personality of the teacher that determines the pupil's election or rejection of the classics. Unfortunately it is not difficult to find high schools where pupil after pupil has dropped out of the Latin classes, so that the mortality has become alarming. This situation is due, not to incompetence on the part of the teachers, but to the fact that they put no "pep" into their teaching. In other words, though they are handling a difficult subject, they do not show enough enthusiasm for it to arouse the interest of their pupils.

The teacher of the classics is really a salesman, and as such he must imitate the qualities of a good salesman. Now the salesman must make his prospective customer want his wares, and after

selling him he must keep him sold. To do this he must have enthusiasm based upon confidence in the value of his wares. And this confidence, to be effective, should be intelligent. The most progressive of our manufacturing concerns realize that this intelligent confidence must have a background. And so the salesman is made acquainted with the nature and quality of the materials used and the process of manufacture, not only through books of specifications, but also through visits to the home plant of the concern, where the operations of manufacture can be studied personally.

If the analogy is correct, the enthusiasm of the teacher should be stimulated by a background of the same character. Therefore, without discounting the importance of the literature, archaeological reports, and photographs, we should give much greater emphasis to the value of travel and study in the homeland of the literature and civilization which we are endeavoring to interpret. For, to take Greece as an example, if one forms a personal acquaintance with the climate and the topography, the sites of the ancient cities, the works of art, and even the customs of the modern Greeks, he will understand and appreciate as never before the literature, the political and economic problems, the artistic sense, and the everyday life of the ancient Greeks. The Acropolis by moonlight, Corinth with its magnificent panorama of plain and sea, and the vista of Marathon from the mountain summit — how they stir the imagination! And how irresistible is the appeal of Mycenae nestling between its two guardian peaks! As I sat on the wall above the Lion Gate in the gathering dusk of a summer's evening, the silent ruins about me spoke eloquently of builders who wrought with astonishing skill and thoroughness. In the foreground lay the royal tombs, so placed and so constructed that even in death their occupants commanded the attention and the admiration of the living. Beyond lay the plain, in the form of a triangle stretching from the Pass of Dervenaki south to Argos, Tiryns, and the sea. Here picturesque villages were scattered amid fields of grain and tobacco and groves of fig and olive trees. Mycenae is indeed eloquent of military power, but it looks down



upon a scene as peaceful as can be imagined. The sun is almost touching the peaks beyond the little plain and the long shadows creep across the fields. The mountains are tinged with a purple haze which clothes their naked sides and softens the severity of their outline. Through the growing gloom floats the tinkling of many bells, as the sheep slowly wend their way homeward. Finally even this note is stilled and the silence of night covers all. Scenes such as this create a background of impressions so full of inspiration that they will awaken an enthusiasm which cannot help being contagious.

On the voyage to Greece I became acquainted with many Greeks who were returning to their native land. Some were carrying large amounts of American money back to Greece. All were carrying back impressions of America — impressions good and bad — based almost entirely upon the material side of our civilization. Our institutions received scant mention. Of America's pocket-book they knew much, of her soul little. Just the reverse, the American teacher who visits Greece may return home penniless, and yet he will bring with him a background of impressions which will be of priceless value in the teaching of the classics.

## THE SUMMER SESSION IN ROME

---

By GRANT SHOWERMAN  
University of Wisconsin

---

The Third Summer Session of the American Academy in Rome, School of Classical Studies, July 6–August 14, 1925, was attended by nine men and forty-five women from twenty-one states, the District of Columbia, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan. Pennsylvania led with eleven, Missouri was next with five, and there were three each from Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, and Ohio. About thirty represented secondary schools, and about twenty were from colleges and universities. There were about twenty Bachelors, about thirty Masters, one Doctor of Philosophy, and one Doctor of Divinity. There were forty-two who received the certificate. Ten others were present and actively working to the end, and there was only one voluntary withdrawal. The spirit throughout was magnificent; nothing finer could be hoped for. The Summer Session at Rome has confirmed itself as a place for workers. The program was varied by a series of happy excursions to the Alban Mount, the Sabine Farm and Tivoli, Ostia, Tarquinia and the Etruscan tombs, Tusculum, the Appian Way, and Hadrian's Villa, and was crowned by a visit to Pompeii, where Inspector Matteo della Corte lectured on the new excavations.

The Fourth Summer Session in Rome will take place July 5–August 13, 1926. The program will consist of one comprehensive and unified course designed to communicate a general acquaintance with the City of Rome from the first settlement to the present time, and a special acquaintance with it in the times of Cicero, Caesar, Virgil, and the first emperors. It will include (1) the history of the City, (2) the monuments of ancient, early Christian, mediaeval, Renaissance, and modern Rome, (3) life and letters in the classical period, (4) the life of modern Italy,

and (5) visits to sites outside Rome. There will be lectures daily in the Forum, on the Palatine, and elsewhere before the monuments. Independent reading and written work will be assigned, and the Academy certificate, recommending a credit of six hours in American graduate schools, will be presented on completion of the work by examination. Necessary expenses, including voyage from and to New York and the Academy fee of \$50, may be calculated at a minimum of \$500. Further notes, with the program in detail, may be had from the Director of the Session, Professor Grant Showerman, 410 North Butler Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

## THE FIRST SUMMER SESSION OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS

---

By WALTER MILLER  
American School of Classical Studies, Athens

---

The first Summer Session of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens was held in July and August of the summer just past. Six students were registered — four for the full six weeks and two for a slightly shorter period. In view of the fact that the regular sessions of the School have averaged no more than seven, the six enrolled this first Summer Session seemed a fairly good beginning.

The purpose of the Summer Session, as announced, was to give its members as wide an acquaintance with Greece as possible in the limited time — its temples, sculptures, and other monuments, and a few of the most important historical scenes and the literature associated with them. Thus, when we visited Marathon and Thermopylae and Salamis and Plataea, Herodotus' accounts of the famous battles were read on the spot; at Colonus Hill, we read a large part of Sophocles' great tragedy; at the "Prison of Socrates" we lived over again with him and his disciples the last day of the great master's life as recorded in Plato's *Phaedo*.

The age of the Homeric heroes also received due attention through extended visits to Mycenae, Tiryns, Minyan Orchomenus, and Minoan Cnossus, with a delightful return voyage by day from Crete along the western Cyclades, with views of various islands from Thera and Melos on the south to Tenos, Andros, and Ceos on the north.

Lasting impressions of the ancient Greeks' oneness of nationality and oneness of destiny were gained by our pilgrimages to the great centres of national religion — Olympia, with its temples

and altars and games; Delphi, in its incomparable setting on the slopes of Mt. Parnassus, with its oracle and state buildings and other monuments; Epidaurus, with its Asclepius, its sanitarium, its gymnasium, and its wonderful theatre; Eleusis, with its mysteries of life and death and the life to come.

But important above all was the opportunity we had of living even for one month in the presence of the Parthenon and Erechtheum and Theseum, the Dionysiac shrine and the vast temple of Olympian Zeus. Treading this sacred ground and moving for a considerable time in the atmosphere of those great idealists and in daily association with the spirit of Themistocles and Pericles, of Socrates and Plato, of Sophocles and Euripides and Aristophanes, of Phidias and Polygnotus, of Ictinus and Mnesicles, cannot fail to put renewed enthusiasm and increased effectiveness into the teacher of the classics who comes for a college year or a summer term to our American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

The splendid Gennadios library was, unfortunately, not available for the use of the students this first summer; but the finishing touches are now being put upon the magnificent Gennadeion in which the Gennadios collections will be duly domiciled before these lines are read, so that this unique collection of original sources will be at the service of the students in Athens during the present school year and during the Summer Session of 1926.



## Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent direct to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

### WHEN WAS DECEMBER 31st, 66 B.C.?

In *Cat. I*, 6, 15 Cicero uses the expression, *pridie Kalendas Ianuarias Lepido et Tullo consulibus*. It surprises one that any editor of a text of Cicero for high schools should feel that he must elucidate this passage with a note to the effect that this means the last day of December. If any note is needed, it should read, "This would be the 29th day of December, for before Caesar reformed the calendar in 46 B.C., December had but 29 days."

Hardy (*The Catilinarian Conspiracy*, p. 106) speaks of Cicero's "laying down office on December 31" (63). Sihler in *Cicero of Arpinum* mentions a possible mob "on December 31st" in 66. Many school editions of Cicero, including such works as those of Chase and Stuart, Allen and Greenough (all editions), Gunnison and Harley, Kelsey, Bennett, Moore (1925), and Scudder's *Sallust*, have notes to the effect that there was a 31st of December in 66 B.C. American editors are not the only guilty ones. The note is found in such English school editions as those of Nall and Herring. Of course such a monstrosity need not cause one to condemn an otherwise useful book, nor need it interfere with the pupil's appreciation of the larger things in Cicero, but it conflicts with the ideals of a scholar who should be obsessed with what Macaulay terms "a sense of beauty and the thirst of truth."

FRANKLIN H. POTTER

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

### DOCTOR WALTER LEAF AND FATE

No one can read the contributions of Doctor Walter Leaf to Homeric studies without benefit and without a sense of gratitude for his skill in solving many baffling problems. So if on one point I criticize, he

still remains an indispensable authority on Homeric matters. I find myself unable to concur with Leaf in his representation of Homer's conception of Fate as he gives it in his *Homer and History*, p. 18.

In this chapter (as in fact in the entire book) Leaf is endeavoring to prove that under the large fictitious element of Homer there lies a solid residuum of fact. We shall not dispute this point. He imagines Homer working over his material and making distinctions between what he regarded as fancy and what as fact. When he recognized something as a historical fact, this he was not at liberty to change. Leaf then quotes Horace (*Odes* III, 29, 45):

*non tamen inritum  
Quodcumque retrost efficiet, neque  
Diffinget infectumque reddet  
Quod fugiens semel hora vexit,*

which, briefly, means that not even God himself can undo what is already done. This recognition of the irrevocableness of the past is, according to Leaf, Homer's conception of Fate. Now Homer, the poet, when organizing his material, may have felt the compulsion arising from the necessities of such a recognition. But Leaf seems to say that this only is Fate, and his quotation from Horace confirms the suspicion. Such a conception restricts Fate wholly to the past and leaves it unconcerned in the future. I do not believe that Homer as a poet could have ideas about Fate differing from those which he attributes to his characters. Fate is not clearly defined by Homer. It certainly lacks the purposefulness of Vergil's conception, but it surely is concerned in tomorrow as well as in yesterday. One must "suffer whatever destiny, and the stern spinning-women spun for him with their yarn at his birth, when his mother first bore him." (*Od.* VII, 197). The frequent association of Fate with the gods suggests an interest in the future.

Achilles has the choice of two Fates, a long and inglorious life or a brief life with glory. One does not choose between two past possibilities. Achilles says: "I know well it is fated for me to die here." (*Il.* XIX, 421). This is the recognition of something yet to happen. Now Leaf may say that Homer is projecting into the past his own knowledge of what actually did happen, but if he makes Achilles thus aware of an approaching event, it is only because the poet himself is capable of such a feeling.

The idea of Fate is vaguely conceived in Homer, but it seems to me to be clear that it was something more than the recognition of the *fait accompli*.

ARTHUR L. KEITH

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

### CATO, *DE AGRI CULTURA*, 83

*Votum pro bubus, uti valeant, sic facito. Marti, Silvano in silva interdius in capita singula boum votum facito.*

Scholars have generally agreed that the vow here intended is to be offered to Mars and Silvanus; hence the comma between *Marti* and *Silvano* in the text of Goetz, in the Teubner series of classical texts. W. W. Fowler, however, in his *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, pp. 132-133, demurs, contending that Silvanus was a mere offshoot of Mars, the great hostile spirit of the woodlands, beyond the limits of the farm. Some corroboration of his contention is found in an inscription, dated 39 B.C., recording the building of an altar to Silvanus, possibly at Caere, on which the name of Silvanus is followed by the letters MAR, which, as Lily R. Taylor says in *Local Cults in Etruria*, p. 121, may possibly refer to Mars. We read of a connection between Mars and Silvanus in Livy (2. 7. 2), where the historian writes that, when the Etruscans were in a panic, a voice coming from the forest of Arsia, declared that the Romans were victorious, and Livy adds that *Silvani vocem eam creditam*.

ELI EDWARD BURRISS

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

### HERACLES UP TO DATE

The methods of big-game hunters, whether mythological or real, are apparently the same in every age. If bow and gun fail and a savage animal is charging, there's nothing for it but to "go after" him with bare hands. "My friend, Carl Akeley, of Chicago," says Theodore Roosevelt in his *African Game Trails* (p. 67), "actually killed bare-handed a leopard which sprang on him. He had already wounded the beast twice, crippling it in one front and one hind paw; whereupon it charged. . . Akeley threw it, holding its throat with

the other hand, and flinging its body to one side. It luckily fell on its side with its two wounded legs uppermost, so that it could not tear him. He fell forward with it and crushed in its chest with his knees until he distinctly felt one of its ribs crack; this, said Akeley, was the first moment when he felt he might conquer. Redoubling his efforts, with knees and hand, he actually choked and crushed the life out of it. . . ."

So Heracles, hunting the Nemean lion, after he has launched in vain two arrows, one at the left flank and one at the chest, whacks the head of the lion with his staff and comes to grips before it can make another charge. "Perceiving now that he was all abroad with the pain and grief of it, ere he might recover his wits I cast my bow and my broidered quiver upon the ground and let drive at the nape of that massy neck. Then from the rear, lest he should tear me with his talons, I got my arms about his throat and treading his hind-paws into the ground for to keep the legs of them from my sides, held on with might and main till at length I could rear him backward by the foreleg, and so stretched him strangled on the ground, and vasty Hades received his spirit." — (Theocritus 25, 262 *sqq.* tr. Edmonds, Loeb Classical Library).

It ought to be said in justice to the demi-god that Akeley was badly bitten, while Heracles evidently got off without a blemish.

FLOYD A. SPENCER

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

### FRETUS WITH THE ABLATIVE CASE

Since the Latin ablative embraces forms that correspond to three distinct cases in Sanskrit, it is assumed by some that the Latin ablative, as it appears in the early literature, represents the fusion of the remnants of full ablative, locative, and instrumental systems. Hence the common practice of treating the uses of the case under these three headings.

It is true that much of the material can be classified very easily on such a basis. But there are some constructions which seem to fall within the general range of ablative, locative, and instrumental meaning, but which it is difficult to assign definitely to one of the three heads, there being some uncertainty as to the exact point of view of the Romans who spoke and wrote the words. Consequently there

has been a good deal of guessing and of diverse and random classification.

So in the case of the ablative with *fretus*. In general the grammars incline to an instrumental interpretation; but Allen and Greenough<sup>1</sup> and Lane<sup>2</sup> classify the ablative as locative in function.

Sometimes it is possible to find in prepositional phrases used as alternates a clue to Roman feeling for an ablative. Thus, if we were in doubt as to the nature of the ablative in *spe destitutus*, the doubt would be resolved on finding the phrase *a spe destitutus*.<sup>3</sup>

It happens that the poet Propertius is particularly liberal in his use of prepositional variants, and one such example may shed much light upon his feeling for the ablative with *fretus*:

Forte super portae dux Veius astitit arcem  
Colloquiumque sua fretus ab urbe dedit.  
*Eleg. iv, 10, 31 ff.*

In this passage the leader of the enemy is thought of as viewing the battlefield from a vantage point over the gate of his native Veii. Before descending to the fray, he makes some remarks in his sheltered position, or, as Propertius puts it, supported (*i.e.* made secure) by his city. In the traditional commentary, these words appear to be much misunderstood; but if correctly interpreted here, such a phrase indicates that, by Propertius at any rate, the ablative with *fretus* was felt as instrumental.

H. C. NUTTING

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

#### MARTIAL VI, 24

Nil lascivius est Charisiano:  
Saturnalibus ambulat togatus.

The gay — or naughty — adjective in the first line seems to have gone over the heads of the conventional commentators, who attempt to explain it as describing the "impudence" of Charisianus' failure to comply with the Romans' custom of donning the synthesis at the Saturnalia. Is it not possible that our author is comparing the butt of this jest with the toga-clad *meretrix*, who was distinguished from

<sup>1</sup> § 431 *a*.

<sup>2</sup> § 1349.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Cicero, in *Cat.* i. 25 (*ab . . . spe derelictus*).



her respectable sisters much as a man in formal *vestimenta forensia* was distinguished from wearers of the accepted garb of the December festival? Dr. Ethel H. Brewster has demonstrated that the synthesis worn by men was identical with that worn by women, or bore to it more than a family resemblance (*T.A.P.A.* 49, pp. 134-136, 141-143). We at least know that dinner garments of the two sexes were so nearly alike that a Roman senator could affect *muliebria cenatoria* with no more serious result than the causing of a few gray hairs in the head of the unfortunate jurist who had to decide whether these clothes should be included among *vestimenta muliebria* according to the terms of his will (Pomponius, *Dig.* XXXIV, 2, 33). If the informal, gay-colored clothing of Saturnalian revelers really did have a womanish appearance, I believe Martial would have been able to discern a degree of genuine *lascivia* in an eccentric non-conformist, especially if he was of the long-faced, "kill-joy" type he so well describes with the words *ambitiose tristis* (I Intro. 12). Cf. Seneca *Epist.* 18.2,3, where we find a discussion as to whether a conscientious Stoic should lay aside his toga with the merry-making rabble.

S. L. MOHLER

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for territory covered by the Associations of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; George Howe, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, for the Southeastern States; A. T. Walker, the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, for the Southwestern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Julianne A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Mr. Walter A. Edwards, Los Angeles High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news — occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.]

### California

*Los Angeles.* — The new Greek theatre at Occidental College, in its beautiful setting in the hills back of the college, was most fittingly dedicated last June by an excellent performance of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* in English. The translation was the work of Professor W. D. Ward and the music was specially composed for this production by his daughter, Mrs. Johnson. The play was under the direction of Gilmor Brown, director of the Pasadena Community Play House. The setting and costumes were a bit bizarre and overcolorful when compared with the usual setting and costuming of a Greek play. The entrance of Calchas and his band was spectacular, likewise the exit of Iphigenia in her garish death's headdress. But these somewhat modern features could well be pardoned when one followed the lines of the beautiful translation of Dr. Ward and the graceful dancing and singing of the chorus. The music off-stage gave a distinct charm to the work of both chorus and principals.

### Maine

*Portland.* — One of the most important sessions of the annual convention of the Maine Teachers' Association held in Portland, October 29-30, was that of the Classical Section.

A committee which was appointed last year for that purpose re-

ported on the present status of Greek in the schools of Maine. The purpose of the program this year was to arouse interest in a revival of Greek in the schools. At present there is very little Greek taught in the secondary schools of the state. There is however an increasing interest in Greek study in the colleges. The point was well established that if Greek is needed it should come in the preparatory school in order that advantage may be taken of the results of such study after the student gets into college.

Two most interesting and stimulating addresses were given. One by Professor J. H. Huddliston, of the University of Maine, on the subject, "A Dollar in Greek." The second address was by Dr. Edward Capps, of Princeton University, the subject being, "Why Greek Should be Taught in High Schools."

Principal Drew T. Harthorn, of Coburn Classical Institute, Waterville, Maine, was the chairman of the meeting and made the report for the committee. Professor J. H. Huddliston, of the University of Maine, was elected chairman for the next year.

A resolution was presented and adopted calling for some closer relation with the American Classical League, and the committee for the coming year will continue the investigation concerning the revival of interest in Greek in the schools of the state.

#### **North Carolina**

Professor George Howe has returned to the University of North Carolina after a year's leave of absence. Professor R. R. Rosborough, who substituted for Professor Howe temporarily, is now head of the Latin department in Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

## Hints for Teachers

---

[Edited by Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. It is the aim of this department to furnish teachers of high-school Latin with material which will be of direct and immediate help in the classroom. Teachers are requested to send to the editor of the department short paragraphs dealing with matters of content, teaching devices, methods, and materials which they have found helpful. Questions regarding teaching problems are also invited. Replies to these will be published in this department if they seem to be of general interest; otherwise they will, so far as possible, be answered by mail. It will, in general, be the policy of this department to publish all such contributions as seem of value and general interest.]

### Latin for English

"Word stories" have been found effective in the teaching of English derivatives, especially in connection with the first and second years of Latin. Miss Loura B. Woodruff, Oak Park High School, Oak Park, Ill., sends the one given below. It was written by W. A. Ellis and first printed in the *Chicago Daily News* under the title "Word Ancestry." Other similar word studies written by Mr. Ellis have appeared in previous issues of the JOURNAL.

Did it ever occur to you that when anything occurs to you it runs against you? Well, that's what it does. The Latin verb *currere* means "to run" and *ob* means "against" or "toward." We have a similar expression in English. For "It occurs to me" we sometimes say "It strikes me." When one incurs debts he runs into them; again the expressions are similar. We often speak of running into debt.

"Recur" means "to run back, to return, to repeat, to occur again." When two or more persons concur they run together, they agree. The current of a stream is its running, its flowing. If a rumor gains currency it runs from mouth to mouth. Money is sometimes called currency because it runs from hand to hand. It often runs so fast it's hard to catch it.

Our English word "course" comes from the Latin *cursus*, a running. A course is something that is to be run. A discourse is a running from one thought to another, a connecting of thoughts. A discursive treatment of a subject is one that runs about from one thing to another, that digresses.

If a person should make a few cursory remarks it would not mean that he was profane. It would mean that what he said indicated that he was not speaking with careful thought, but hastily—"on the run," as we might say.

### The Bulletin Board

In the following paragraphs on the location and use of the bulletin board Mrs. Clara F. Milligan, North High School, Columbus, Ohio, has suggested a practical means of extending the influence of the study of Latin beyond the limits of the classes in which it is taught.

A serious problem confronted a class that wished to use a bulletin board. The recitation room was small, and all available wall space was needed for blackboards. By a happy thought a solution was offered which met with the principal's approval. In the hall, outside the classroom door, a frame about three and a half by two feet was placed just above the wainscoting and was covered with burlap stretched tight. Every pupil passing north on the second floor was obliged to face this spot and turn west in front of it. Thus publicity was secured. Interested groups gathered there curious about the exhibits.

Committees of pupils assumed the task of providing fresh material. Posters, pictures, poems, cartoons, clippings, succeeded each other in pleasing variety. At one time a contest between Trojans and Tyrians aroused enthusiasm. Dido's kindly words, *Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur*, were posted as guarantee of impartiality in the judges, who pronounced their decision at the Latin Club party at the end of the chosen period.

To insure thoughtful consideration of what was published, a report was presented at intervals in each class on the meaning or value of the successive exhibits. The plan proved effective, "selling" Latin to the school.

### Verbarium

Professor H. M. Kingery, Worthington, Ohio, sends this description of the old game of "Verbarium." Using only the letters of the word he has chosen for illustration, he has written out more than two hundred words which occur in Caesar alone, but because of limitations of space only a part of them are printed. The game has the merit of leading pupils unconsciously to a larger vocabulary.

Select a Latin word with several vowels and some consonants, and have the students write out all the Latin words which can be made with those letters, using each only as often as it occurs in the parent word. This word for the first exercise should not be too long—say six or eight letters—and if the letters all are different, so much the better; e.g. *Labiensus, Cornelius, ridens*.

Vocabulary range may be unlimited, but it is better confined to the author being read or even to one book or a limited portion. In some editions of Caesar, for example, the vocabulary indicates what words occur in the first, second, third, or fourth book, so that it is easy to confine the lists to any one or all of the four.

Of a given word one form only may be allowed, or all its inflectional



forms which can be spelled with the letters in the parent word. A good way is to have the first form listed and followed by its inflectional forms in parenthesis in the same paragraph.

Proper names may be permitted or excluded as is agreed. Adjectives, including participles, may be listed in their nominative singular forms (one, two, or three), as in the dictionary.

After some practice in making lists the quantities (natural) in the parent word may be marked and only such words listed under it as contain the vowels in their proper quantity. It is best to permit the listing of but one word of a given spelling, *e.g.* either *ortus* (participle) or *ortus* (noun), but not both.

Special rules may be adopted according to the judgment of teacher or class.

Parent word: *optaverimus*

Alphabetic order: *a e i m o p r s t u v*

## A

aes (aeris, aeri)	i (is; it, imus, ito, ite, ire)
amor (amoris, amori, amore, amores)	iam
aperio (aperui)	impero (imperas, imperat, impera, imperato)
apertus, -um	impetro (impetras, impetra)
aptus, -um	impetus (impetu)
aries (arietum)	importas (importes, importa)
armo, armes, armet, armetis)	imposita
ars (artis, arti, artem, arte, artium)	impositura
artus, -um	imposui
asper, -um	improvisa
at	ipse, ipsa, ipsum
auris (auri, aurem, aure, aures)	is, ea
aut	iste, ista
autem	ita
aversa, -um	item
averto (averti)	iter
avis (avi, avem, ave, aves, avium)	iterum
avus (avi, avo, avum, avorum, avis)	itura
e	iuro (iuras, iurat, iurem, iures, iuret, iura, iurato, iurate)
emo (emis, emit, emas, ematis, emitto, emi)	ius (iure, iura)
emptus, -a	iusta
eo (eam, eas, eat, eamus, eatis)	iuvo (iuvas, iuvat, iuvem, iuves, iuvet, iuva, iuvato, iuvate)
es (est, eram, eras, erat, eramus, eratis, ero, eris, erit, erimus, esto)	Maior, maius
et	mare (maris, mari)
etiam	mas (maris, mari, mare, mares)
etsi	mater (matris, matri, matre, matres)
	mature

maturo (matures)  
 merito  
 meritus, -a, -um  
 metior (metiar)  
 meto (metis, metas)  
 metus (metui, metu)  
 meus, -a  
 miser, -a

mora (moraе, moras)  
 mori [infinitive]  
 mors (mortis, morti, morte)  
 mos (moris, mori, more, mores)  
 motus, -a  
 motus (motui, motu)  
 moves (movet, moveas, moveat,  
 move, movetis movi, movit)

### Latin Rules in Jingles

Teachers of Latin continue to testify to the helpfulness of rhymes and jingles in fixing a knowledge of language principles. The eight which are here printed with slight modifications were collected by Mrs. Clare Bocquin, University High School, University of Minnesota.

#### I

When the subject's doing it,  
 Passive forms don't help a bit.

#### II

To conjugate most any tense,  
 I only need a little sense.  
 I take the stem and add the sign,  
 Then make the ending fall in line.

#### III

Infinitives end in *re*  
 In most all verbs except "to be."  
 Drop this *re* and keep in mind  
 The vowel reading which you find,  
 Long *a*, long *e*, short *e*, long *i*,  
 And conjugating's merely pie.

#### IV

Imperfect forms insert an *e*  
 In *i-o* verbs, before the *b*.

#### V

The perfect passive tense to make  
 A form from *sum*, "I am," we take.  
 Before this form *portatus* stands,  
 And this is all our tense demands.

## VI

When a neuter *I*-stem you wish to decline,  
Put an *i* in the plural every time.  
In the ablative singular also agree  
Such neuters take *i* where others take *e*.

## VII

With verbs of motion towards a place  
Use always the accusative case.

## VIII

Duration of time and extent of space  
Are always expressed by the accusative case.

How long — how far — when you would tell,  
Accusative forms will serve you well.

## Games for Latin Clubs

"Our young people have found it one of the most interesting games they play," is the recommendation which accompanies the following game. It bears the caption, "A Latin Picture Gallery," and is contributed by Miss Loura B. Woodruff, Oak Park High School, Oak Park, Ill.

Around the walls of the room are hung small posters, each bearing a newspaper or magazine picture, or other device suggesting a Latin word, and each numbered with a Roman numeral. Then a list of the words illustrated is given to each member of the club, and the boys and girls proceed to match pictures and words, placing the number of the identified picture besides the word it suggests. The following is a list of words used in a club composed of pupils studying the second semester of Latin I:

*Praemium* (illustrated by an *A+*); *liberī* (several children); *verba* (a list of words); *castra* (a camp); *patria nostra* (a map of the U. S.); *impedimenta* (trunks and bags); *deus* (Jupiter); *agricola* (a farmer); *sum* (a column of figures added up); *annus* (a calendar of any year); *pōnī* (a pony); *capitīvus* (a bird in a cage); *cōpia* (a mass of flowers); *amīcī* (a boy and a dog); *silva* (a forest scene); *navigant* (two boys in a sailboat); *nōmen* (a page from a fashion sheet); *vidī* (a tiny *D*); *librī* (a row of books); *arma* (pistols and guns); *pugna* (a wrestling match); *quattuor* (four boys); *pedēs* (some feet taken from a shoe advertisement); *carrī* (children's wagons); *porta* (a gate in a fence); *epistula* (an addressed envelope).

**The Classical Reading Circle**

The committee in charge of the Classical Reading Circle desires to call attention again this year to the advantages offered through its channels. The purpose of this Circle is to encourage private reading of classical authors. A specific list of authors is provided, offering considerable range from which a choice may be made, and the committee has prepared a list of annotated textbooks for each author. Provision is made also for the selection of any author outside the list. In this way the prospective reader is given opportunity to study some Greek or Latin author not previously read or to review work which has grown unfamiliar through lapse of time. It is difficult, in these days of crowded schedules and extra-curricular duties, to find the necessary time and initiative for such reading, but the effort is made easier by the knowledge that others are doing similar work in the Reading Circle. Registrations should be made as early as possible. For the lists of authors and annotated textbooks and other information send a self-addressed envelope to the chairman of the committee, Professor A. M. Rovelstad, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

## Book Reviews

*The Republic of Plato.* Translated into English with Introduction, Analysis, Marginal Analysis, and Index by B. Jowett. The Third Edition Revised and Corrected Throughout. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925.

Some months ago there appeared in the *London Mercury* a statement of Professor Phillimore, that during the world war the plates of Jowett's translation of Plato had been melted up to make munitions of war. The reviewer shed a sentimental tear as he thought that the new generation would no longer have as its teacher the great Master of Balliol, who had brought Plato's dream to fulfillment at Oxford, and who for more than a quarter of a century had been the friend and adviser of "nascent and crescent" British statesmen. He remembered how without ever having seen Gildersleeve or Jebb or Jowett in the flesh, he had been the pupil of these great teachers through the instrumentality of the printing press. But the Syndics of the Clarendon Press must have heard the dripping tears, for now they are announcing a fresh volume of Jowett's translation of Plato's *Republic*, printed on beautiful paper, from new plates, page for page, and line for line like the edition of 1892. In thirty-three years much water has flowed beneath the bridge. In that interval Shorey's *Unity of Plato's Thought* and Stewart's *Plato's Doctrine of Ideas* and many other useful books about Plato have been printed, and it is conceivable that Jowett, sitting somewhere among the eternal archetypes, has had a chance to modify some of his views. It is not likely, however, that he would greatly alter his introductory essays and analyses, if he were alive among us today. If he were re-translating the *Republic*, he would probably follow his old method of making a first draft, scrupulously following the Greek text. Then he would lay aside the Greek and spend months in polishing the translation, and there would creep in the inaccuracies that have been the despair of the meticulous, and of those who were in need of a fool-proof pony. The general result would be much the same as the trans-



lation of 1892,—and the grace and charm of the work would still lure on many a reader who might be repelled by the efforts of a more crabbed translator. The world needs Plato, even if the world cannot read Plato in the original Greek. Until our greatest scholars have come to an agreement concerning the precise meaning of the toughest passages in the *Republic*, the intelligent public has a vested right in Jowett's translation of Plato, even if οὐ μέντοι ἥττον ἐφαίνετο πρόπειν ἢν οἱ Θρᾷκες ἔπεμπον does not exactly mean: "But that of the Thracians was equally, if not *more*, beautiful."

CHARLES N. SMILEY

GRINNELL COLLEGE

*Homer and His Influence.* By JOHN A. SCOTT. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series). Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1925.

To convey an adequate impression of Homer and his influence to the non-classical reader is a hard task at best; it becomes unspeakably harder when strict economy of space must be observed. Professor Scott had to limit himself to about thirty thousand words. It is obvious, therefore, that the history of the Aegean world as it has been revealed by the discoveries at Tiryns, Mycenae, Cnossus, and Troy can claim very little attention. Likewise, a minute discussion of Homer's influence on later literature in the manner of Finsler's *Homer in der Neuzeit* is entirely out of the question. Limitation of space obliges Professor Scott to suggest and imply, at times on a very large scale. For example, to show the importance in modern literature of the many mythical figures in Homer, Professor Scott has chosen for illustration one of the lesser and more obscure of the number, Proteus. The fact is brought out that Proteus' name has found its way not only into many passages in literature but also into the realms of botany, biology, and zoölogy, retaining in each case the quality which characterized the Homeric Proteus, instability or changeableness. This is an example of the far-reaching influence of Proteus' name, and from it the reader may judge the importance of other and more significant figures in Homer. It is largely the conception of this chapter that has made possible the discussion of Homer and his influence in a book of such limited dimensions.

The volume consists of twelve chapters, six being devoted to Homer and his poetry, and six to Homer's influence. The chapter

on translations of Homer should convince non-classical readers of the shortcomings of even the best translations, whether prose or verse.

In this book Professor Scott has employed his usual, vigorous style, a style not marred by wearisome statistical tables nor encyclopedic listings. Number I of "Our Debt to Greece and Rome" seems destined to win new friends for classical antiquity in general and Homer in particular.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Ad Alpes.* A Story of Roman Life. By HERBERT C. NUTTING, Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1923. Pp. vii+193.

The unfortunate fact concerning attempts to provide material for third-year Latin folk is that the subject-matter must be just as well suited to the minds of seventeen-year-old youth as is their English reading material. This means that there must be set in good Latin ideas too difficult, involving words and phrases too abstract and too uncommon, to be within the capability of a student of Cicero who has had only two short years of experience translating Latin. If our American youth started his Latin in the seventh grade at the age of twelve years, the advisability of which is a mooted question, subject-matter of the nature of *Ad Alpes* might interest him more at fourteen than as a bass-voiced youth of seventeen.

The author, fully aware of this handicap, has brought forth this text to supply the Latin teacher with material comparable to that which the modern language teacher has at her command when her pupils have acquired a sufficient foundation in vocabulary and grammar to undertake reading in page quantities. It is devised for the teacher who is ready to break away from what she is pleased to call the stentorian tones of a high-grade egotist and plunge her pupils into a story of considerable length; which involves interesting characters; which relates the events of the whole to a definite end; which introduces the inexperienced translator to an easy but correct Latinity; and which brings him into contact with the more difficult constructions gradually, imperceptibly, painlessly.

Professor Nutting has made his story portray Roman life. A Roman family party is travelling by sea from Ephesus to Brundisium, thence northward by the Appian Way to Rome, then onward to the

Alps. As the party passes over historic ground, the mature members relate to the children the deeds of famous Greeks and Romans, some authentic history, other legendary and mythical, but all most entertaining to young folk. A Hebrew maid in the party furnishes stories of the Bible such as "Sampson," "David and Goliath," "Daniel and the Lions," "Jonah," "The Exodus from Egypt," "Solomon's Judgment." Short excerpts from Horace, Catullus, Ovid, and Vergil find appropriate places. Much of the colloquial portions smack of Plautus in style. There are scraps and near-scraps and the faithful slave who resents the intrusion of impostors and interferes at the wrong time.

In this manner of treating the story, interweaving tales of mythology, history, and legend with the main events of the account, the author has scored an important point. Pupils are not interested in reading isolated stories. There is nothing that bores the average Latin pupil more than unrelated stories of the legendary kings. But if somebody in the party picks up a chunk of wood and bets that it is part of the bridge that Horatius defended, all will want to know the story. It is upon this idea that the author depends for creating interest in his narrative.

Not only has the author kept the interest sustained; he has written his narrative in a Latinity that would win Cicero's nod. This reviewer believes that Cicero might complain because *inquit* in the colloquial passages has no substitute, being used nearly a thousand times in the fifty chapters, exactly 396 times in the first twenty chapters. This is many times more frequent than the writer ever saw it in print. But let Cicero wince at that; he will smile approval, throughout the pages. The idioms and syntax have received most careful attention, and to the mind of the writer the Latinity is as nearly classic as "made-Latin" can be. The sentences are mainly short and the fifteenth chapter is the first that would afford any difficulty for even a third-semester pupil. Cicero's seemingly senseless disorder of words the author makes no attempt to imitate. One reason why Cicero trips our pupils so often is because of this unusual dislocation of related words. Consequently, if the practice of reading Latin as Latin gains favor in the second year, the art of translating Cicero's works will languish. Classes of two or three pupils each, super-prodigies, may attempt it. The others will take French or Spanish. Accuracy, good Latinity with adherence to simple ideas,

sustained interest, — these are three essentials with which Professor Nutting distinguishes his story.

Undoubtedly the author does not expect *Ad Alpes* to supersede, but to supplement, Cicero's orations. There is really sufficient material for the entire third year, the text containing some 5950 lines, or 2800 more than the customary six orations of Cicero and 1000 lines more than the first six books of the Aeneid. The fifty lessons are uniformly of three pages each, increasing to four toward the end.

As the text stands today, it is without vocabulary and notes, or much else save the foreword and the body of the text. If the author produces as excellent accessories as the chassis, with quantitative markings and numbered lines, appropriate photographs, the Latin fraternity will have another lure by which to keep likely young Latinists from leaving our banner for that of the proponents of modern languages.

DORRANCE S. WHITE

ANN ARBOR HIGH SCHOOL, MICHIGAN

## Recent Books

[Compiled by Joseph W. Hewitt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.]

- Aesop, The Fables of.* Text based upon La Fontaine and Croxall. Illustrated. Chicago: A. Whitman. Pp. 254. \$1.25.
- ALY, WOLF. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.* (Handbibliothek des Philologen). Leipzig: Velhagen und Klasing. Pp. 418. M. 8.
- BLACK, JANE. *Mythology for Young People.* New York: Scribner. Pp. 149. \$.60.
- BONUS, A. R. *Where Hannibal Passed.* With 12 illustrations and map. London: Methuen. Pp. 96. 7s, 6d.
- Caesar. Commentaries on the Civil War.* Edited by C. E. Moberly. New illustrated edition. London: Milford. Complete, 5s. Books I-II, 3s. Book III, 3s.
- COCCHIA, ENRICO. *La Letteratura Latina anteriore all' influenza ellenica.* Parte II. Napoli: Rondinella e Loffreda. Pp. 197. L. 10.
- ENSSLIN, W. *Zur Geschichtsschreibung und Weltanschauung des Ammianus Marcellinus.* Leipzig: Dietterich. 1923. Pp. 106. M. 3.50.
- FOORD, EDWARD. *The Last Age of Roman Britain.* Illustrated. London: Harrap. Pp. 294. 15s.
- FOWLER, H. T. *The History and Literature of the New Testament.* New York: Macmillan. \$2.50.
- GARDNER, R. W. *The Parthenon: its science of forms.* New York: New York University Press. Pp. 35. \$15.
- HAYES, D. A. *Greek Culture and the New Testament: A plea for the study of the Greek Classics and the Greek New Testament.* New York: Abingdon Press. Pp. 224. \$1.50.
- HEINZE, R. *Von den Ursachen der Grösse Roms.* Leipzig: Teubner. M. 1.80.



- HILL, IDA THALLON. *Rome of the Kings*. New York: Dutton. Pp. 266. \$3.00.
- JAYNE, DR. W. A. *The Healing Gods of Ancient Civilizations*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Pp. 608. \$5.00.
- JÜTHNER, JULIUS. *Hellenen und Barbaren*. Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins. (Das Erbe der Alten) Leipzig: Dietterich. 1923. Pp. 165. M. 3.
- Livy. *The Close of the Second Punic War*, being Livy, Books XXIX-XXX. Edited by H. E. Butler. London: Milford. 3s, 6d.
- MCARTHUR, WILLIAM, Editor. *Latin Lyrics*, with measured music. London: Cape. 2s, 6d.
- Matriculation*. Model Answers: Latin, being model matriculation papers in Latin with solutions. London: University Tutorial Press. Pp. 143. 3s.
- MÖTEFINDT, HUGO. *Zur Geschichte der Barttracht im alten Orient*. (Sonderdruck aus Klio). Leipzig: Dietterich. 1923. Pp. 64. M. 1.20.
- MOREY, L. C. *Naples through the Centuries*. New York: Stokes. Pp. 239. \$4.00.
- MUNZER, FR. *Die Politische Vernichtung des Griechentums*. (Das Erbe der Alten) Leipzig: Dietterichs. 1925. M. 2.80.
- MULDOON, H. C. *Lessons in Pharmaceutical Latin and Prescription Writing and Interpretation*. Second edition, revised. New York: Wiley. Pp. 187. \$1.50.
- MURRAY, GILBERT. *Five Stages of Greek Religion*. A revision of the *Four Stages*. New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. 276. \$3.50.
- NEWALD, R. *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie*, usw. II. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von R. Newald (Das Erbe der Alten) Leipzig: Dietterich. 1924. Pp. 413. M. 14.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Selections. Edited by A. W. Roberts and John C. Rolfe. (Roberts and Rolfe Latin Series). New York: Scribner. Pp. 121. \$.80.
- POSTGATE, J. P. *On Ancient Greek Accentuation*. London: British Academy. 5s.
- ROHR, J. *Der Okkulte Kraftbegriff im Altertum*. Leipzig: Dietterich. 1923. Pp. 133. M. 3.50.
- ROHDE, ERWIN. *Psyche; the cult of souls and belief in immortality*

among the Greeks. (International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, etc.) London: Kegan Paul. Pp. 642. 25s.

ROSE, H. J. *Primitive Culture in Greece*. London: Methuen. Pp. 255. 7s, 6d.

SCHUR, W. *Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero*. Leipzig: Dietterich. 1923. Pp. 118. M. 3.50.

STEMPLINGER, ED. *Die Ewigkeit der Antike*. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Leipzig: Dietterich. 1924. Pp. 156. M. 3.50.

WINBOLT, S. E. *The Roman Villa at Bignor, Sussex*. London: Milford. 1s.